The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

A History of the Theology of the Disciples of Christ

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE

GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL

16,459

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(Department of Systematic Theology)

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BX 7321 .V3 1907
~~286.6~~
~~V26~~
16,459

By
HIRAM VAN KIRK

St. Louis
Christian Publishing Company
1907

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
286.6
V26
16,459

Copyright, 1907.
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PREFACE

The writer has seen fit, for the benefit of the popular reader, to preface the study of his topic with a brief sketch of the history of theology from the beginning to the appearance of the special phenomena under consideration. He works from within the movement, and has often used the technical name, "The Current Reformation," used by its advocates as best expressive of the whole.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

I. Essence of Christianity.
  1. Distinction between,
    (1) The Christian Principle,
      a. A sense of worship toward God.
      b. A sense of brotherhood to all of God's creatures.
    (2) Historic Forms of Christianity.
  2. Tendencies.
    (1) Essential Protestantism.
    (2) Essential Catholicism.
  3. Primitive Christianity Defined.

II. Jewish Christianity.
  1. Defined.
  2. Problems.
    (1) Mosaism.
    (2) Messianism.
  3. Transition.
    (1) Paulinism.
    (2) Hellenism.

III. Greek Theology.
  1. Factors.
    (1) Faith in Jesus.
    (2) Greek Philosophy.
  2. Product.
    The Logos Doctrine.
  3. Dogmas.
    (1) The Trinity.
    (2) The Twofold Nature of Christ.

IV. Latin Theology.
  1. Representative—Augustine.
  2. Factors.
    (1) Pauline Gospel.
    (2) Greek Dogmas.
    (3) Neo-Platonism.
    (4) Roman Law.
    (5) Vulgar Catholicism.
  3. Problems—Sin and Grace.
  4. Dogmas.
    (1) Adam.
    (2) Adam's Fall.
    (3) Corruption of the Race.
    (4) Gift of Christ.
    (5) Baptismal Regeneration.
    (6) Free Grace.
    (7) Highest Good.
  5. Solutions.
    (1) Augustinianism.
    (2) Pelagianism.
    (3) Semi-Pelagianism.

V. Scholastic Theology.
  1. Factors.
    (1) Traditions of the Church—Matter.
    (2) The Greek Philosophy—Method—Aristotle.

2. Dogmas.
(1) Atonement—Anselm.
(2) The Church—Aquinas.
3. Outcome.
(1) Tridentine Catholicism.
(2) The Ultra-Reformation.
(3) The Reformation.

VI. Protestant Theology.
1. Principles.
(1) Justification by Faith.
(2) Authority of the Scriptures.
(3) Universal Priesthood of All Believers.
2. Periods.
(1) First Generation.
(2) Second Generation.
(3) Post-Reformation Scholasticism.
3. Dogmas.
(1) Old.
(a) The Trinity.
(b) The Twofold Nature of Christ.
(c) Sin and Grace—Predestination.
(d) Atonement.
(2) New.
(a) Justification by Faith.
(b) Authority of the Scriptures.
(c) Inspiration of the Bible.
4. Divisions.
(1) Lutheran.
(2) Reformed.
(3) Mediating.
(a) German Reformed.
(b) Anglican.

CHAPTER II.

THE COVENANT THEOLOGY.

I. Statement.
1. Historical Background.
(1) Calvinism.
(2) School of Saumur.
(3) Arminianism.
2. Life of Coccejus.
3. Analysis of De Foedere et Testamento Dei.
(1) Definition.
(2) Elements.
(a) Lex.
(b) Promissio.
(c) Cominatio.
(3) Twofold Nature.
(a) Foedus Operum—Its Abrogation.
(b) Foedus Gratiae—Its Promulgation.
4. Later Contributions.
(1) Burman.
(2) Witsius.

II. Historical Significance.
1. Possible Sources.
(1) The Bible.
(2) Political Philosophy of the Times.
2. The Genesis of Social Contract Theory.
(1) Aristotle.

(2) Stoics—Lex Naturae.
(3) Roman Law—Jus Civile et Jus Gentium.
(4) Cicero—Lex Naturae—Jus Gentium.
(5) Aquinas—Lex Naturae et Lex Instituta.
(6) Grotius—Lex Naturae—Jus Gentium.
(7) Coccejus—Lex Naturae—Foedus Operum.
3. Development.
(1) In Politics.
(a) Grotius.
(b) Hobbes.
(c) Locke.
(d) Rousseau—"Contrat Social."
(e) American Revolution.
(2) In Theology.
(a) Covenant Note in Calvinism.
(b) *The Marrow Theology.*
a. William Ames.
b. Edward Fisher.
c. Thomas Boston.
d. The Seceders.
(c) Translations.
III. Connection with the Current Reformation.
1. Fact.
(1) Lifework of Alexander Campbell.
(a) Sermon on Law.
(b) Progress of Revelation.
(c) Debates.
(2) Analysis of His Teachings.
(a) Definition.
(b) Ninefold Covenant.
(c) Way of Salvation.
(d Positive and Moral Precepts.
2. Influence.

CHAPTER III.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LOCKE.

I. Statement.
1. Preparation—Bacon; Des Cartes.
2. Life of John Locke.
3. Analysis of the Essay on Human Understanding.
(1) Occasion and Purpose.
(2) Problems.
(a) Origin of Knowledge—Tabula Rasa Theory.
(b) Degrees of Knowledge.
a. By process of Reason.
1. Certainty.
(a) Intuition.
(b) Demonstration.
2. Probability.
(a) Belief.
(b) Opinion.
b. By process of Revelation—Faith.
(c) Limits of Knowledge.
4. Outcome.
II. Connection with the Current Reformation.
1. External Evidence.
2. Internal Evidence.
(1) Theory of Knowledge.
(2) Origin of Language.
(3) Knowledge, Belief and Opinion.

(4) Definition of Faith.
(5) Doctrine of Revelation.
(6) Work of the Holy Spirit.

III. Influence.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRECURSORS.

I. The Reformation in Scotland.
II. The Established Church.
III. The Scottish Sects.
1. Cameronians.
2. Seceders.
(1) Associate Presbytery—Erskine.
(2) Presbytery of Relief.
(3) Burghers and Anti-Burghers.
(4) New Lights and Old Lights.
3. The Scotch Independents.
(1) Old Independents.
(a) John Glas.
(b) Robert Sandeman.
(2) Scotch Baptists.
(a) A. McLean.
(b) Wm. Jones.
(3) New Independents.
(a) Robert Haldane.
(b) Jas. A. Haldane.
(c) Greville Ewing.
IV. Influence on the Current Reformation.

CHAPTER V.

THE RISE.

Introduction.
I. The English Brethren.
1. Circular Letters of Churches Holding to the Primitive Order.
2. Mr. Campbell's Review of Their History.
3. His Connection with Them.
II. The Disciples.
1. Sketch of the New York Church.
2. Walter Scott.
3. Their Contribution.
III. The Reformers.
1. Thomas Campbell.
(1) Sketch.
(2) Contribution—Emphasis on Christian Union.
2. Alexander Campbell.
(1) Sketch.
(2) Contribution.
(a) Application of principles.
a. Church government.
b. Baptism.
c. The Confession.
d. Faith.
e. The Lord's Day.
f. Work of Holy Spirit.
g. Progress of Revelation.
h. Nomenclature.
i. Design of Baptism.
(b) Proclamation of the Reformation.

3. Origin of Early Churches.
Brush Run.
Wellsburg.
Pittsburg,
Louisville and Nashville.
Washington Association.
Mahoning Association.
Churches in Kentucky and Virginia.
4. Separation from the Baptists.

IV. The Christians.
1. B. W. Stone.
(1) Sketch.
(2) The Springfield Presbytery.
2. Their Contribution.

Conclusion.
1. Proof of Thesis.
2. Origin of Names.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRINCIPLES.

I. The Ultimate Principle—The Conversion of the World.
II. The Material Principle—The Union of All Christians.
III. The Formal Principle—The Restoration of Primitive Christianity.
Items.
1. No Creeds.
2. Bible Names for Bible Things.
3. Primitive Order of Worship.
4. Primitive Organization.
5. Primitive Discipline.

Conclusion—Observations and Exhortations.

CHAPTER VII.

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION.

I. Sources.
II. Rules.

CHAPTER VIII.

THEOLOGY OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

I. Cosmology
II. Bibliology.
III. Theology.
Doctrine of the Trinity.
IV. Anthropology.
V. Christology.
VI. Soteriology.
1. Faith.
2. Repentance.
3. Baptism.
(1) Action.
(2) Subject.
(3) Design.
(4) Place.
VII. Pneumatology.
VIII. Ecclesiology.
IX. Eschatology.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

A Brief Sketch of the History of Theology from the Apostolic Age to the Close of the Reformation.

In order to place the average reader in touch with the period of history out of which we wish to draw the threads of this narrative, we make a brief sketch of the progress of Christian thought from the beginning to 1648.

1. The Essence of Christianity.

One must distinguish between the Christian Principle and any of the historic realizations of Christianity. The first is the core, the essence, the inner principle of Christianity, which runs through all ages, and is the vital redemptive force in the world. The second is the shell, the phenomenal, the outer form of Christianity. It is Christianity subjected to the limitation of any particular time, place, race, and moral and industrial conditions of society. Thus, we have one Christian Principle —in all and through all—and many historic forms—as Apostolic Christianity, Greek Christianity, Latin Christianity, etc.

The source of Christianity is Jesus. Its essence is best seen in his consciousness. What he realized in his life with the Father, what he gave to the world in his teaching, in his work, in his person—this is the Gospel, his Word of God to men. Two elements are prominent in this kernel:—(a) A sense of sonship to God; (b) A sense of brotherhood of all of God's creatures. The first is Christian Faith—a trust in God through Jesus Christ, the sense of forgiveness, of favor in his sight, of union and communion with Him,—reliance on Him,—self-resignation and peace in the midst of the conflicts of the world. It is the filial feeling raised to its highest power. The second is Christian Love—the fraternal duty which springs from filial trust. "For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen cannot love God whom he hath not seen." This core is a faith, personal, not propositional. It is faith in Christ as Savior, as moral guide—the willingness to live the Christ kind of a life; not the belief of any truth about him, however true this may be. It is religio-ethical, not intellectual-legal. It is not mere Orthodoxy. Again, this core is Life, not doctrine, not institution. It is a relation to God

realized in the inner life,—filial and fraternal; not in the saving value of right thinking, not in any historic form idealized and handed down *in toto*. It is not any kind of High Churchism. Lastly, the Christian principle is Gospel, not Law. It proclaims the freedom of the child of God from any bondage to sin or to a law for sin. It is the love principle regnant in the life, not any subjection to detail rules. It is not Judaism.

Hence, two tendencies are ever present in Christianity,—to preserve it in principle and propagate it as such, and to realize it in form and hand it down as such. The one is essential Protestantism,—the attempt to get back to the Eternal Word of God stripped of all temporal forms. The other is essential Catholicism,—the attempt to bring the Word of God into the life of the race and bless it thereby. One is the individualistic, prophetic; the other, the universalistic, the traditional. Both are good tendencies. They have always been present in the church. They are the complements of each other.

Primitive Christianity was the first historic realization of the Christian principle. It had the advantage of all others, in that it was nearer the source; in that it was under the personal direction of Jesus and His Apostles; in that it had the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Here enter some crucial questions in the determination of the character of the original church and its normative relation to other periods. In how far does the Divine Spirit, and in how far does the human enter to make up the empirical content of Primitive Christianity? Did Jesus care for the spirit, merely, and leave the form to take care of itself?

Did He teach His Disciples His view of God, His view of the world, i. e., His religion, to have faith; then send them out with the impulse to take the world, leaving it to them to adapt their message and work to the forms of the world around,—or did He anticipate these forms also, and fix them for all time? In how far may Christianity be said to have taken the form of Judaism,—the soil from which it grew? How much was it affected by the limitations of the Jewish nation; its racial characteristics; its religious inheritance? What in Primitive Christianity was meant to be a norm for all religion? In how far does its precedent remain a rule for faith and practice to-day?

These are ground problems in any treatment of the Christian religion. They have been much discussed among the Disciples of Christ; and between them and their religious neighbors. I leave them here, as they will come up later; with the mere distinction between the Christian principle and its historic forms.

Jewish Christianity.

In the Jewish world Christianity found historic forms ready made for it. It took over a language and literature. The Old Testament became the first Bible of the Christians. Religious rites and customs were adapted to the new cause. This is evident from the analogy of the Lord's Day and the Sabbath, of baptism and the Levitical washings, of the Lord's Supper and the Passover Feast. The new institutions were modeled on the old. Compare the Jerusalem Church and the Jewish Temple service, the local church and the synagogue, the Apostolate and the Sanhedrim, the ministry of the church and that of the synagogue. Here lies patent a continuous course of conflicts in the history of Christianity,—viz., between its historic heritage and its prophetic spirit, between the traditional tendency and the new truths ever welling up within the bosom of the church. The Apostolic Age was no exception. It was not a period of ideal peace and unity—a golden age, as many have supposed. There were conflicts, divisions, ill-feelings as now. These arose from the contradiction of the Christian Principle with the historic Jewish heritage. They appeared in two forms:—(1) Mosaism; (2) Messianism.

1. Should the Christians keep the Law? It must be remembered that the Law meant a concrete mass of detail regulations hedged about by the traditions of the Rabbis. Various answers were made. The Judaizers said, "Yes, it is necessary that the Gentile converts should be circumcised and keep the Law." Paul said, "No." And between these there was a mediating party, to which possibly James and Peter belonged, who held that the Jews should keep the Law, but that Gentiles were not so obligated. The Pauline party won the victory, but this was due, not so much to any triumph of logic within the church, as to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army. When it was no longer possible to keep the Law, its importance faded from sight.
2. The Messianic Hope passed through a like crisis. The Disciples repeatedly misunderstood Jesus upon this question during his ministry. It is probable that they were not wholly free from errors as to the Second Coming after Pentecost. There is a gradual dropping of Jewish Messianism in the Apostolic writings. In Paul it is an early note, but found little place in the major epistles. It is wholly absent in the Fourth Gospel. It lived on among the common people and

sprang up in the Montanism of the third and fourth centuries. But with the decay of the Jewish nation it became a minor note.

Hence the important fact for the history of Christianity in the first three centuries is the rejection of the religion of Jesus by the mass of the Jewish people, the decadence of that nation, and the passing over of the Gospel treasure to the Gentiles. This is the transition from Jewish Christianity to Greek Christianity, from the Jerusalem Church to the Old Catholic Church, from Peter, James, Paul and John, to Clement, Origen, Athanasius and the Gregories.

Two media may be mentioned in this transition—Paulinism and Hellenism. Gentile Christianity was the product of Paul's ministry. It is significant that his doctrine is the most theological in form. The field in which Paul worked was Hellenism—that larger world of Greek learning which had spread over the whole eastern half of the Roman Empire. Philo, the apostle of Hellenism, had made a union of the Hebrew Scriptures and the Platonic philosophy by means of the allegorical method of interpretation. This was incorporated into the church by his successors—the Alexandrine fathers, Clement, Origen, etc. The Apostles' Creed, which had grown up from the Baptismal Formula, became the text for future theological developments.

The Greek Theology.

What form should the Christian Principle take in the Græco-Roman world? Two factors must be taken into account in the reply—the Christian Principle itself, and the Weltanschauung (view of the world) incident to the Greek mind. With the Jew there was no such contrast. The Gospel was set in the forms of his own view of the world. But the Greek was essentially a philosopher. Behind him were Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and Epicureans. He had a made-out scheme of things. This was simple except in religious matters. Scepticism had destroyed the power of the old myths. The Christian missionary found the door opened for him. Many Greeks "turned to the Lord believing the Gospel." For a while things went on thus. The newly made convert held the two apart—the Greek heathen view of the world and the Jewish-Christian religious life. But this partition could not last interminably. The human mind seeks unity. The two spheres must be brought together. Then began the eternal conflict between Philosophy and Religion, between Science and Faith. In this conflict occurred the birth-throes of Theology. It was the mind's attempt to harmonize, to interpret the religious experiences of the heart in the language of cool thought, to make room in a world filled with things and events for the invisible God,

and to find the true avenue for the soul's communion with Him.

How, then, should the Greek put together what he knew as a Greek and what he had learned as a Christian? He had no thought of giving up the former. It was essential to his mental makeup. The latter offered no substitute. It dwelt in another world. The two poles were the Greek metaphysics on the one hand, and the Worship of Jesus, on the other. The ruling conception of the former was the Realism of Plato. God is the Absolute Reason. This is pure thought, free from all form. It finds expression in the Logos. The Logos, or Word, is Reason expressed, i. e., in its most universal form. This is further differentiated in the ideas (ἴδεα). The Logos is the universal idea. Other ideas are the genera and species under this. These ideas are as yet disembodied spirit, but they are embodied in the particular—in things of the world of matter, and in minds of the world of spirit. Knowledge is by contact of the two. It recognizes the unity back in the Absolute Reason. Now, the Gospel was made to fit into this system of metaphysical idealism. *The Logos was identified with Jesus.* The harmony was made complete. The outcome after much conflict was the two Greek dogmas,—the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Twofold Nature of Christ. In the first the Son is declared to be ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί (of the same substance with the Father), and in the second Jesus is said to be ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιος τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα (consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood). Both of these dogmas are metaphysical. They pronounce upon the nature of God and of Christ. The distinction was between οὐσία and ὑποστάσις, substantia and persona.

These dogmas were codified in the councils of Nicaea (325 A. D.), of Constantinople (381), and of Chalcedon (451). They constituted the bulk of the Greek Theology. They were accepted in the West. When Luther revolted from the Roman Church, he fell back on them, and thus they were incorporated into Protestantism.

The Latin Theology.

With the decadence of the eastern half of the Roman Empire, the heritage of Christianity passed over to Italy and the West. On Latin soil a new product arose. The Latin mind was practical and political. It was not speculative. It was filled with the memory of the glory and grandeur of the Roman Empire. The new product was the Roman Catholic Church, the successor to the Empire.

In Latin Theology there is but one great name—*Augustine.* There is a preparation for him in Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, but Augustine

is both flower and fruitage of Latin thought. Five elements enter to make the body of his system:

1. The Pauline Gospel.
2. The Greek Theology,
   whose dogmas he took over.
3. Neo-Platonism—
   A working over of Platonism by means of Oriental influences resulting in the emanation theory.
4. The Roman Law—
   Roman legal conceptions which came down through Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose.
5. Vulgar Catholicism—
   Heathen rites and mysteries which were taken over into the church, and became the basis of the later developments of the "mass" and "works."

Thus, Augustine was a great personality which gathered up all that preceded, held it in spite of apparent contradictions, and became the source of all that followed. He is the great father of the church—of the Roman Church, whose imperialism, mysticism, monasticism, vulgar Catholicism, came by him; and of Protestantism as well. Luther found in him his doctrine of Justification, and Calvin's Predestination was but a modified Augustinianism.

The problem of Augustine was the *religious* one—the relation of man, the sinner, to God. He asked, what is the source, nature and goal of the human personality. He came to this problem as a Roman with the practical, common sense mind. He lived in the midst of the breakdown of ancient civilization, saw decay written all around. He had himself lived an immoral life when a youth, and knew the awful struggles between good and evil in his own soul. He was instructed by Paul, and led to turn away from the vain speculations of philosophy to the heart of the matter as set forth in the Gospel. It was his beyond all others to have a realizing sense of man's sin and to produce the great dogmas of Latin Christianity,—viz., those grouping about *Sin* and *Grace*. His points were as follows:

1. Adam—
   A perfect being. This is in reality the personification of one of the Platonic ideas and not the Adam of the Scriptures at all.
2. Adam's Fall.
3. The Corruption of the Race.
   The nature of fallen Adam is carried over to his descendants —Traducianism. This is "Original Sin."

4. The Gift of Christ.
   This makes possible the Grace. It is not developed by Augustine, but is later taken up as the thesis of Anselm.
5. Baptismal Regeneration—
   A magical infusion of grace which removes the guilt of "original sin."
6. Free Grace.
   This creates in man all faith and goodness, over against which the heathen virtues are only splendida vitia.
7. The Highest Good—
   Meditation on God (Adhærere Deo).

All later theology deals with these points. How can God and man meet in salvation? Three answers were made.

1. Augustinianism.
   Man can do nothing; all is of grace; this is made possible by the gift of Christ,—a Determinism.
2. Pelagianism.
   Man is not so helpless; he is free; he can meet God halfway,—Indeterminism. There is room for human merit.
3. Semi-Pelagianism.
   A combination of the above. All is of grace in regeneration. Afterward works are necessary to retain the saving goods,—Synergism. There is room for merit within the church.

After Augustine came the invasion of the German hordes. Gregory the Great becomes the great savior of the Church and the founder of the future Papacy. A long period of anarchy ensues. There is no advance in thought. Only the personality is preparing for a new enlightenment.

The Scholastic Theology.

The new enlightenment for which the world had been preparing occurred in the Middle Ages (1000-1250 A. D.). On the soil of Mediaeval Europe grew up a new dogmatic product. It had been prepared for by the feudal system, the supremacy of the Papacy, the intellectual life of the universities, and the religious labors of the monastic orders. This product was the Scholastic Theology. Its method was Scholasticism. Its leaders were Scotus Erigina, Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, Abelard, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus.

Two factors enter into the body of this theology.

1. The Traditions (writings) of the Church
   These are—
   a. The Holy Scriptures.
   b. Greek and Latin Fathers—Augustine is foremost.

c. Lives of the Saints, etc.

2. The Greek Philosophy—

(1) Neo-Platonism—

At first via Scotus Erigina.

(2) Aristotle—

Through a translation first of the Logic, later of both Logic and Metaphysics.

The first factor gave the matter for theology; the second, its method—the Aristotelian logic. The Church said, "Deus homo fit." Scholasticism asked, "Cur Deus homo?" A division was made between Natural and Revealed Theology. Natural Theology was what reason could give—as the existence of God, his power, etc. Revealed Theology comes through the Church. Its motto was: "Credo ut intelligam." Assensus (assent) is faith. The theologian goes as far with Natural Theology as he can, then Revelation steps in. Philosophy is the handmaid to Theology.

The new problems are—(1) The Atonement; (2) The Church.

1. Atonement.

Anselm took the problem of the Atonement over from Augustine. Augustine said, the gift of Christ makes Grace possible. Anselm shows how. It is by way of his Satisfaction Theory. In Adam's fall man has sinned. God must have satisfaction. As a sin against an infinite God, it is infinite and must have an infinite punishment. How can man escape and satisfaction be made? Man cannot make it himself, yet he must. It is his sin. God alone can. The dilemma is solved in the God-man. As God he can pay the debt; as man it is of avail for the race. Because he was blameless, he had no debt of his own. As a free-will sacrifice, his act was infinitely meritorious. God must reward it, yet He cannot. The God-man has all fullness before. He gives the benefits over to his fellow-men. This is the store of merit which men receive in relation with Christ.

The premises of this theory are evident:

a. The Satisfaction which punishment renders for sin. Man takes from God his due—perfect obedience. God must retaliate. He takes from man what is his—happiness. God's honor is offended. His magnanimity steps in to avoid the disastrous results. The background of the doctrine is the Chivalry of the times.

b. The dogma of the Twofold Nature of Christ—the *God-man.*

In the argument the fallacy of the divided middle term occurs several times.

c. The notion of Solidarity—God, God-man, man. This is from the Platonic Realism and does not agree with the modern conception of personality.

Yet Anselm set the problem for all time. It was a great advance over the conception of a ransom from the Devil, or the theory of God's veracity. He brought in the ethical element. Who can solve the antinomy between Justice and Mercy in the Divine Nature? Aquinas with his Federal theory, Duns Scotus with his Acceptilation theory, Grotius with his Governmental theory, only build upon Anselm's naïve but real foundation.

2. The Church.

Thomas Aquinas presents the dogma of the church in its fullest development. He is seized with the imperial idea—Papal Absolutism. In him the Vulgar Catholicism comes to its triumph. *The Church mediates Grace.* It is the vicar of God on earth. It is the incarnation of Deity in various degrees of fullness. The order of ascendancy is—Papacy, hierarchy, laity. The church possesses the store of the merits of Christ and of the Saints. Christ is offered continually in the miracle of the mass. The individual appropriates the Grace through the "works" demanded of him. This Church is declared to be "One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic."

Aquinas marks the culmination of dogmas and their co-ordination in a system of theology (Summa Theologiæ). Then began the breaking-up of dogma, which lasted throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and in the sixteenth century issued in the three-fold partition: (1) Tridentine Catholicism; (2) Socinianism; (3) Protestantism.

Duns Scotus is the critic and skeptic through whom most of the dissolution is accomplished. Scholasticism was founded upon the thesis that God was Absolute Reason, and sought to find the truth by analysis and syllogism. Scotus said that God is *liberum arbitrium* (Free Will). He magnified impulse, action, as against the rationalizing process. The world had grown tired of the refinements of Scholasticism and had begun to distrust the reasoning powers. All parties hastened to accept the principles of Scotus.

1. Tridentine Catholicism.

First among these was the Papal Party. Scotus was a loyal son of the Church and labored in its behalf. If God is primarily Will, that will is known through the Church. The Church mediates the Word of God. This is identified with the rules and practices of the Church. These are under the care of the hierarchy. Instead of dogma, we have a dogma-politik. The Church becomes the one dogma and is jealous of any other. This is illustrated in the Council of Trent. The Papal Party did not want the Council called. When it was forced upon them, they did not want to formulate a creed. The creed when formed was ambiguous in character. They wanted to leave the hierarchy free in all matters of doctrine and practice. The culmination of this course was the Council of the Vatican (1870), which set forth the doctrine of Papal Infallibility—"that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that *infallibility* with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiffs are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church." (Schaff—Creeds of Christendom, II. p. 270). Henceforth there is no need of Councils or dogma.

2. The Ultra-Reformation.

There had all along been elements in the Church which were hostile to the claims of the hierarchy. These took refuge in the practical piety of the church and lived apart from its dogmas. They were the disciples of the "inner light," "seekers after God"—the mystics, the forerunners of the Anabaptists. Alongside were others who found their truth in the Natural Theology, who pitted reason against the church; as yet a smouldering flame, but ready to break out when the wind stirred—the Rationalists, the forerunners of Socinianism. Duns Scotus too prepared the way for these. If God is Will, this is not known through the church, but through my will, my impulses, my insight. Here appears the sense of the growing Individualism, which is to play so great a part in modern civilization.

In the Middle Ages, the collective will, the universal, was everything. There was little sense of personality, or of the rights of the individual. The so-called Ultra-Reformation was Individualism carried to the extreme. Luther turned against his Anabaptist followers, Carlstadt and Munzer, with ferocity. Calvin opposed Servetus and Faustus Socinus with all his might.

3. The Reformation.

The Reformation proper is seen in Martin Luther. Luther was a combination of the two—

a. The religious sense.

A conviction of sin which allows the absolute domination of any system which gives relief to the conscience. Hence, the power of the Roman Church over him.

b. The growing Individualism,

which shakes off all human mediation in the attempt to know God for itself.

The Reformation grew out of the heart experiences of this humble monk. At first he sought relief in the Church. He set out to make a conquest of heaven. If anything was to be gained by "works," he was determined to have it. He submitted himself to all the penances, and practices of the most rigid monastic order, but still he did not find peace. He sought a satisfaction which the Church could not give—one for himself, an individual assurance. How could he know he had made satisfaction; i. e. was "justified before God?" This led him to the larger question—"How can a sinner be justified before God?" He had tried the "works" of the Church. They were not sufficient. He searched everywhere for help. He read Tauler. Staupitz advised him to read Augustine. He got some relief. He saw the sentence in the creed: "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." Then he fell back on Paul—"The just shall live by faith," and brought out his great principle, *Justification by Faith.* God has revealed his grace in Jesus Christ. A sinner is justified solely through faith in Christ. There are no "works" of merit. All is reliance on God's grace in Jesus Christ. The core of the Christian religion is a living faith in a living God who has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. Objectively there is the person and work of Christ—the historical factor. Subjectively, all is *Faith.* This new yet old gospel of Luther spread like wildfire. It found ready response

in the awakening life of a new age. The outcome was Protestantism with its cardinal dogma—Justification by Faith.

Protestant Theology.

Protestant Theology is based on three principles:

1. The Material Principle—*Justification by Faith.*

   This is in antithesis to the Catholic doctrine of meritorious "works." Salvation is through grace by faith. Faith is the true approach to God. It is all that is required. The moral life flows therefrom as the stream from its source. It is a matter of religious experience. It is the sense of sonship, of inner and immediate relation to God.

2. The Formal Principle—the *Authority of the Holy Scriptures.*

   The Roman Church held to a manifold literature—Scripture, the Fathers, creeds, lives of saints—all of which were traditionally authoritative. The Reformers limited the authority to the Holy Scriptures. "The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants."

3. The Social Principle—*The Universal Priesthood of all Believers.*

   This is placed over against the claims of the hierarchy. There is to be no mediation. Each conscience is free before God.

Thus, Protestantism was a return to the Christian Principle effected by a new religious experience in use of the Holy Scriptures.

It developed in three periods:

1. The First Generation.

   This was the Reformation proper. It embraced Luther, Melanchton, Zwingli, in their earlier lives. This early ground was receded from because of the extremes of the Anabaptists. The Reformers really joined the Catholics in a common opposition to this false subjectivism. They fell back on the Greek dogmas. These are the first articles of their creeds. Here Zwingli remained firmest on the original ground. This period was marked by but one principle—the Material, Justification by Faith.

   The proof of this is the literature of the period. Luther's position grew out of his own religious experiences. His appeal was to this, and only to the Scriptures as the interpreter of the experience. He assumed a somewhat independent attitude to the Scriptures and dealt with them freely. For instance, he called the Epistle of James a "book of straw," because it did not teach his doctrine of Justification. In Melanchton's "Loci"

(First Edition 1521), the Scriptures are placed alongside of the Fathers as the literature of the church, and not in a separate category. In the Augsburg Confession—The first Protestant creed (1530)—the order of articles is (1) God; (2) Original Sin; (3) The Son of God; (4) Justification, etc. There is no article on the Holy Scriptures. (Schaff—Creeds of Christendom, vol. III., p. 7).

2. The Second Generation.

In this period affairs have changed. This is seen in the Formula of Concord (1576). The preface to this creed is upon the "rule and norm" of truth, which is declared to be the writings of the Old and New Testaments" (Schaff—Creeds, III., pp. 93-95). The articles are stated as drawn from these Scriptures. The Gallican Confession, a creed written by Calvin (1559) is another instance. Article I. is on God. Article II. is as follows:

> "As such this God reveals himself to men; firstly, in his works, in their creation as well as in their preservation and control. Secondly, and more clearly, in his Word, which was in the beginning revealed through oracles, and which was afterward committed to writing in the books which we call Holy Scriptures."

Article III. names the books which are to be accepted as canonical (Schaff—Creeds, vol. III. p. 360.) In fact, this is the period of Calvin. The two principles—the Authority of the Scriptures and Justification by Faith—are formulated and appear side by side. But the Formal Principle is placed first in order, even if as yet it has not the chief place. The Social Principle has been relegated to the background. This is due to the rise of the Anabaptists, against whom a damnatory clause is to be found in the creeds of the period. The cause of the change to this ground was the purpose of defence. The Protestant apologists set over against the authority of the Church and the Fathers, the authority of the Scriptures. The Bible is declared to be the Word of God. Thus, the Reformation claimed an authority prior in age and equal in dignity to that of their Catholic opponents. Their cry, as Chillingsworth at last stated it, came to be, "The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants."

3. Post-Reformation Scholasticism, or Elder Orthodoxy.

This was the period of decadence. It was inevitable. The

Reformation occurred on the soil of western Latin Christianity. It was a new religious experience. The eternal conflict of the new Christian experience and the old Weltanschauung was renewed. At first the reformers led the revolt against the traditional philosophy. Luther was a Humanist. He was bred in the Renaissance movement. As such he translated the Bible into the vernacular. He hated Aristotle. Melanchton, however, though at first under Luther's influence, fell back more and more into the Aristotelian method. This is significant, in that he was the scholar of the Reformation. The impetus thus given was readily taken up by others. Soon Scholasticism was back again as the method of Protestant Theology. This was unavoidable. The Reformation had brought with it no new philosophy and logic. The Individualism of which it was born was as yet mainly sub-conscious. In the realm of religion this spirit had found its first expression. Luther's assertion of the soul's direct communion with God—the Social Principle—was a beautiful flowering of the principle of the Autonomy of the Reason. But in the excesses of the Anabaptists this principle was crushed to the ground. It had to await a far later time for reappearing—viz., in politics in the time of Cromwell and in the French Revolution; in philosophy, in the persons of Locke and Kant.

This period can be understood only when the apologetic and polemic attitude of Protestant Theology is borne in mind. It is the period of the great religious wars. By the valor of the warriors for truth, the Roman Catholic theologians were met on their own ground. The Aristotelian logic was used to defend the Bible as it had been to defend the Church. The great systems of Gerhard, Hollaz, Quenstedt, Calov, appear. There is only one principle—the Formal. This is converted into a theological canon. *The Holy Scriptures are the source of the supernaturally revealed truths of theology.* This theology was made a means of salvation in itself. It was a vision of God. The Bible was not interpreted historically, but the dogmas were read into it. It was made a law-book of homogeneous value for faith and practice. It was identified with the Word of God.

The outcome is seen in the *Dogmas* accepted among Protestants. These are:

1). The Greek dogmas—

a. The Trinity;
b. The Twofold Nature of Christ.
This is elaborated into a new Christology conformable to the Protestant doctrine of the Sacraments.

2). The Latin dogmas—Sin and Grace as transformed into the doctrine of Predestination.

3). The Mediaeval dogma—the Atonement.
(The dogma of the Church was denied.)

4). New dogmas—
a. Justification by Faith:
b. Authority of the Scriptures.
These are the principal products of the Reformation.
c. The Inspiration of the Bible.
This stated in brief is, that *the record of Revelation found in the Bible was edited by God himself.* Three conceptions enter into this dogma (See Kaftan, The Truth of the Christian Religion, vol. I., p. 200).
(a). Revelation.
God has revealed himself in many ways, especially by his *Word.* This Word was first orally pronounced.
(b). Scripture.
Afterward the Word was committed to writing or at least the most important parts of it. For us who do not live in the time of the oral revelation, this Scripture is the Word of God.
(c). But this is not sufficient guarantee for the infallible authority of the Scriptures. In the work of committing to writing, who made the proper selection, whose memory was trustworthy enough to retain the divine words inerrant? Could this be left to natural human means? The answer is the doctrine of Inspiration. God through his Holy Spirit oversees the whole process and vouches for every result.
(d). Infallibility is thus secured.
This dogma of Inspiration is the peculiar product of the Post-Reformation Scholasticism. It may be said by some that there had always been a doctrine of inspiration. This is true, but not in the Protestant sense. With the Catholics the Church is inspired. It is infallible. Any authority which the Bible has is due to the fact that it is one

of the traditional writings of the Church. On the other hand, Protestantism made the Bible the seat of authority. This can be only if the Bible is wholly divine—Verbal Inspiration. This is the crowning dogma of Protestantism. It is the crucial question for Protestant theology. It remains unsolved to this day.

The two great divisions of Protestantism are the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. These are due to many causes, chief among which are the national differences. The Lutheran Church is of German origin—Luther; the Reformed, of Swiss French—Zwingli, Calvin. They were two independent movements. In those days the Union tendency was not strong enough for a formal union. At the Marburg Conference (1529) the leaders agreed on fourteen and a half of the fifteen propositions. But Luther refused the hand to Zwingli, who was willing to compromise, and nothing was effected.

The doctrinal differences were mainly:

1. On the Eucharist.

   Luther held to the doctrine of the Real Presence (Consubstantiation); Calvin to that of the Spiritual Presence; Zwingli that the Lord's Supper is merely a memorial.

2. On Predestination.

   Luther was an Augustinian, but did not make the doctrine prominent; Melanchton was a Synergist; his later views approached those of the Catholics; while Calvin made Predestination the central doctrine of his system.

3. On the Principles of Protestantism.

   The Lutheran Church rested upon the Material Principle. It affirmed the freedom of the child of God. It was a reaction against the Judaism of the Roman Church. The Reformed Church builded upon the Formal Principle. The Scriptures are the rule of faith and practice. It asserts the ethical purity of the Christian life. It was the reaction against the paganism of Catholicism. It was Puritanism. This church spread throughout Switzerland, France, Holland, Scotland and America.

Between the two above are to be noted the mediating churches. These are:

1. The German Reformed Church.

   This is the church of the Palatinate. Philip of Hesse, its landgrave, favored union at the beginning. Melanchton became the ruling theologian in this province. Bucer, a friend

to all parties, was the founder of this church. Its positions are set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism—a symbol of fervent piety and of religious worth.

2. The Anglican.

CHAPTER II.

I. Covenant Theology.

The preparation of the Protestant World for the Current Reformation was made by two preceding movements; one in the realm of theology, the other in that of philosophy. The first of these was the Covenant Theology of the Netherlands. This gave the fundamental theological category to the Campbells and their co-laborers. The second was the philosophy of John Locke, which gave them their theory of knowledge. By the use of these methods, they did all their thinking, and found a ready understanding in the popular American mind. Let us trace in brief the genesis, growth, products of each of these factors; and show, if possible, their influence on the leaders of the Current Reformation.

I.

THE COVENANT THEOLOGY.

The so-called Dutch or Covenant Theology is represented by a school in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century. Its leaders were Coccejus, Heidanus, Momma, Burman, Van Til and Witsius. Associated with them was Grotius, the statesman. This school sprang up on the soil of the Reformed Church. It was one of a series of reactions against the scholastic spirit as applied to the main tenet of that Church; viz.: Predestination. Calvin had been the great defender of Protestantism. Over against the Romanist doctrine of merit by human works he set his dogma of Predestination. This was a thoroughgoing determinism. Everything happens according to the Divine decrees. These are eternal and unchangeable, and fix the course of events and the destinies of men. They are twofold:

(1) A Decree of Election;
by which a part of the human race without any merit of their own are chosen to eternal life.

(2) A Decree of Reprobation;
by which another part, as a just punishment of their sin, are left to eternal damnation.

This negative counterpart of Election proved to be the stumbling-block of Calvinism. Calvin confessed it to be a "decretum horrible,"

but held that it was nevertheless true. He appealed to God's Will; which is always holy and unblameable, though inscrutable. But the question came: How far do the decrees apply? It was agreed that they applied to all events of the fallen race; that all faith, goodness and holiness of sinful men are not the cause or condition but the effect of Election. But was the fall of Adam to be included? Did God decree that man should sin; or did He only permit the sin, so that the decrees entered after the Fall? The first is Supralapsarianism; the second Infra- (or Sub-) lapsarianism. Calvin wavered between the two, but inclined to the former; while Beza, Gomar and others, true to their master's logic, took the extreme position. They said: "God has a double fore-ordination,—for the manifestation of His mercy in the elect and of His justice in the reprobate; call Him the Author of sin if you like, it is true." But the masses shrank back from this harsh dogma. It was never embodied in any of the leading creeds of the Reformed Church.

Soon there began movements for the mitigation of the doctrine. The first of these was the school of Saumur, viz.: La Place, Cappel, Amyraut and other French scholars. These distinguished between a universal and a particular predestination. By the first, God wills that all men be saved; but this is made particular only in those who do not reject the universal grace. The positions of this school were not very clear or consistent. They were seeking to grant some human part in the work of salvation. They caused great commotion in the French Church; but after a time peace was agreed upon and the controversy subsided.

But the fire soon broke out in a new place. James Arminius appeared in the Netherlands, a convert to the doctrine of universal grace. Joined with this, he held to the freedom of the will. Thus arose Arminianism, whose Five Points were condemned at the Synod of Dort (1619) but found supporters among those high in the political circles of the country; as Barneveld, Hugo Grotius and others. This movement spread into England; entered non-religious circles and produced marked effects in the history of modern ethics. Arminianism presented the doctrine of Conditional Predestination! God has decreed to save those who by the grace of the Holy Spirit believe in Jesus Christ, and by the same grace persevere to the end. It was not so different from Calvinism after all; which, to use a Kantian phrase, was an a priori determinism, while Arminianism was an a posteriori determinism; one by the Holy Spirit and not by the decree; one in experience and resistible as such. Thus room was made for human responsibility.

At this juncture the Covenant Theology came in. Many thinkers had been feeling their way in this direction in their efforts to solve the antinomy of Calvinism; but the first to give it clear and definite statement was the Netherlander Johannes Kock (Coccejus). Born at Bremen, 1603, he passed through the schools of his country and came finally to Franeker, where he received his theological education. Here he was under the instruction of Amesius, the noted English divine, and Amama, the great Orientalist. Here also he met Grotius, the statesman. He went forth as a linguist, and taught Biblical philology at Bremen (1630), at Franeker (1636); whence, for some notable work in the dogmatic field, he was called to be Professor of Theology at Leyden (1650), which position he held until his death in 1669. He attained fame as an exegete, wrote some two dozen commentaries and was the first to lay down the principle that the meaning of a word is to be ascertained from its context. He broke from the orthodox fashion of reading the dogmas into the text and tried to restore the historical sense of the Scriptures. He thus made the first attempt at a biblical theology. In 1648 he published his greatest work—

"De Foedere et Testamento Dei."

The title of this book shows the category which he applied all along the line in his interpretation of the Scriptures. Let us make a brief synopsis of the book.

Coccejus, in beginning, seeks to disclose the meaning of his term—not by definition, but by citations from the Scriptures (Chapter I). Thus: "an agreement (conventio) concerning peace and friendship, either before or after war" is called a covenant (foedus). Such a covenant Abraham made with Mamre (Gen. 14:13). Such is the agreement between man and wife (Mal. 2:14) (Sec. 1). Thus, a covenant is made with just and equal stipulations and sworn promises from both parties (Sec. 2); for in a covenant there are both precepts and promises. So God makes his covenant by presenting a law and the promise annexed to the law, and thus he invites to the assent to the law and to the expectation of the promise (Sec. 3). It is a διαθήκη rather than a συνθήκη (Sec. 4). For the covenant of God with men (Foedus Dei cum homine) is not as those of men with one another. Men make covenants for mutual benefits, but God has his own purpose, viz., to declare the plan by which His love is perceived, and union and communion with Him is made possible (Sec. 5). Thus, the covenant is μονοπλεῦρον (one-sided). God lays down all the terms (Sec. 6). This covenant is twofold: Foedus Operum et Foedus Gratiæ (a Covenant of Works and a Covenant of Grace). In these the Scriptures contrast two ways of

obtaining righteousness and happiness. They are, hence, called two laws—Lex Operum et Lex Fidei, Rom. 3:27 (Sec. 11). The covenant of works is set forth in Gal. 3:12, 10. "What things a man doeth he shall live in them." "Cursed is everyone which continueth not in all the things written in the book of the law to do them." It has three elements:

(1) Lex (Law).
which shows the plan for the appropriation of the divine love and benefits.

(2) Promissio (Promise)
which joins these with that plan.

(3) Comminatio (threat)
which excludes all other plans and ways to the highest good and indicates the necessary consequence of punishment for sin. (Sec. 12).

In the case of Adam the covenant was not written in a book, for Adam being upright and in the image of God, it was written on the tablets of the heart. It was the law of nature (Lex Naturæ), or of conscience by which Adam naturally knew what was right, and which remains in the fallen man. The Decalogue is identical with this Lex Naturæ. It is the Foedus Operum in a written form (Sec. 13). This covenant requires perfect obedience. The reward for this obedience was life, the punishment for disobedience, death (Sec. 42).

Coccejus, thus having shown the constitution of the Covenant of Works, proceeds in Chapter III to end, to describe its Abrogation, and the placing in its stead of the Covenant of Grace. This Abrogation progresses in five steps. The law or Covenant of Works is done away:

(1) As far as the possibility of making alive
Through Sin (per peccatum).

(2) As far as the condemnation
Through Christ, set forth in promise and apprehended in faith.

(3) As far as the terror or power of the fear of death and servitude
Through the promulgation of the New Covenant, the expiation for sin having been made.

(4) As far as grief for sin
Through the death of the body.

(5) As far as all effects
Through the resurrection from the dead (Sec. 58).

When Adam sinned he made the promise useless. There could be no life or happiness according to the covenant, because man had failed

to fulfill its conditions (Sec. 59). As the whole of human nature was involved in his act, death and evil came upon the race (Sec. 70). Man, thus condemned by the law of this covenant, and shut out from any good thereby, is yet obligated to do all things which the law of nature and God by right of this dominion demand of him. He must at the same time suffer punishment for past sin and render obedience as present duty. No future obedience can redeem him from past error, nor be substituted for the least precept. Hence, in this covenant there is no hope. Man but stores up wrath for the day of wrath (Sec. 71). But God himself provides a remedy. It is the Covenant of Grace (Fœdus Gratiæ). This is the agreement (conventio) between God and man the sinner by which God declares the free gift of justification (justitia) and the inheritance of his child given through Faith in the Mediator, which Faith itself is the beginning of the restoration and return to peace, friendship, and the hope of the inheritance in good conscience (Sec. 76). In this covenant ten points are to be noted:

a. The good obtained (bonum), which is justification (justitia) and life (vita).
b. The manner of conferring,—a gift.
c. The Mediator
through whom and by whom the gift is made—Jesus Christ.
d. The Means by which the good is possessed—
Faith.
e. The Partakers—
Believers.
f. The Source—
The Good Will of God.
g. The Proclamation of the Good—
The Promises in the Old and New Testaments.
h. Human Powers Demanded—
None; it is of Grace.
i. Permanence.
j. Final End—
The Glory of God.

The promulgation of the Covenant of Grace in the Sacred Scriptures is of two kinds:

(1) In Expectation of Christ,
whose subjects live under the promise.
(2) In Faith in Christ
having been revealed. (Sec. 278).

The first corresponds to the Old Testament; the second to the New

Testament. Thus the Covenant of Grace falls into two dispensations, in both of which Christ is set forth in an elaborate system of typology. They differ mainly in the degree of clearness in which the grace is revealed. The final abolition of the Covenant of Works and the condemnation thereby is through the death of the body and the resurrection from the dead.

This doctrine of Coccejus was defended by his pupils, Heidanus and Momma. It was further elaborated by Burman and Witsius. Burman distinguished three steps in the Covenant of Grace:

(1) Oeconomia ante legem
(2) Oeconomia sub lege
(3) Oeconomia post legem;

in the course of which the Law was first in the form of conscience (Lex Natura); then in a written form (Lex Mosis), and lastly Christ appeared as the perfect personal law. The promise was first the protevangelium (Gen. 3:15), then ceremonial types and prophecies, and lastly Christ himself as the personal grace. The community was first the family; then the Jewish people; then mankind. The form of government was first the patriarchal order; then a priestly theocracy; then free fellowship. Each is an advance on, yea, a reformation of the preceding! At the first God spake with man direct; then through the law and prophecies; now through the New Testament. In each dispensation the sacraments win more and more meaning. Witsius still more adapts the dogma to Bible facts. He finds not three periods, but a still greater number. In his great work, "The Economy of the Covenants of God with Men," he falls back upon the contrast between the Old and New Testaments; but finds subdivisions in each period, which in turn have their own proper covenants. Thus, in the Old Testament there were four periods: (1) From Adam to Noah (2) From Noah to Abraham (3) From Abraham to Moses (4) From Moses to Christ (Book III, Ch. III). In the New Testament, Witsius also observes various periods, as described by the Revelation of John; which the Church as yet has experienced only in part; which also he does not undertake to define (Book III, Ch. III, Sec. 19). Thus Witsius applies the Covenant category in greater detail than any of his predecessors; but neutralizes his results by insisting on the unity in substance of all the covenants; and strangely enough, made himself quite acceptable to all parties. It is his work which had the wide circulation and was the authority on the covenants for a *century*. Such was the system of Covenant Theology in the Netherlands.

II. Two Questions Remain:

(1) What is the historical significance of the Covenant Theology?

(2) Is there an historical connection between the Covenant Theology of the Netherlands and that of the Current Reformation?

That the Covenant Idea appears first as a dominant category in theology with Coccejus is proved:

a. There is no mention of it in the Augsburg Confession, Formula of Concord, or principal creeds of the Lutheran Church.

b. It is not found in the principal creeds of the Reformed Church, except the Westminster Confession, which was later.

c. It appears in the early part of the seventeenth century in many quarters. E. g. Wm. Ames in England, Grotius in Holland (Fisher, Hist. of Doct. p. 348, note) as the product of a common time spirit.

Coccejus, though probably not the first to use the idea, became the voice of the age's groping after a great truth. Henceforth his statement became the instrument of all others.

A. Whence, then, did Coccejus get his Covenant Idea, or at least the suggestion of it? Two answers are possible—

(1) From the Bible itself; (2) From the political philosophy of the times.

Both are doubtless true. The book of Genesis in the Old Testament and that of Hebrews in the New are especially rich in the terms and conceptions used by him. But he extended the category over the whole area of the Bible, gave such terms as Law, Nature, Sin, Grace, Promise a coloring not native to the text, and constructed thereby a philosophy of history which an independent study of the Scriptures can not justify. Just at this time (1625) Hugo Grotius had published his famous book

De Jure Belli et Pacis.

It was so popular that it soon ran through several editions. It was highly prized by men of state. Gustavus Adolphus carried a copy about with him in his campaigns and slept with it under his pillow. Oxenstiern made its author, though a Netherlander, the Swedish ambassador at Paris. The Pope paid his respects by placing the book in the Index Expurgatorius. Grotius became the founder of a new science—International Law. The influence of Grotius is evident upon the face of Coccejus' book. Direct reference is made to him in sections 1 (two times), 2, 4, 14, 28, 54, 55, 68, 87, and others. These are mainly corrections of exegetical positions taken by Grotius, and only prove Coccejus' acquaintance with his works. Again, Grotius was only one

of many authors who lived in this period and who were struggling to express the same thoughts,—e. g., Ollendorf, Gentilis, Ayala, Althusius, etc. This common truth of the time was the doctrine of the Social Contract, which was destined to play so great a part in later social and political developments.

Let us sketch the natural history of the Social Contract theory. Of this there are two roots, the Greek and the Latin. The beginning was made with Aristotle in his famous dictum, "Man is by nature a political animal." By this he meant that man finds his true being, not in isolation, but in a state, in a society with his fellowmen. The Stoics began to develop the idea, "man by nature," and in their doctrine—"to live according to Nature"—brought it to the forefront of ethical philosophy. But Nature with the Stoics was not Nature in the modern sense—a complex of sensible objects. It was the objective reason, the mind of God in things, which gave them unity, order and intelligence. A like reason was manifest in the mind of man. There was a divine element in him. To live according to Nature was not an appeal to the lower sensuous nature, but to the intelligence of a man, to the common reason in mankind, to the divine reason as manifested in both minds and things which make up the world-whole (κόσμος). This was the Lex Naturæ of Greek Philosophy.

The Roman Law was the bedding of the other root. The ancient jurists made the distinction between Jus Civile and Jus Gentium. The Jus Civile (Civil Law) held for all dealings of one Roman citizen with another. It grew out of the institutions of the state. But in the case of a Roman citizen dealing with some member of any one of the subject nations, these inner legal enactments did not hold. Here the standard was the Jus Gentium (Law for the Nations). This meant the principles of right and justice generally accepted among mankind, the common law of the world. Cicero marks the juncture of the two currents. He identified the Lex Naturæ of the Stoics with the Jus Gentium of the Roman Law. This conjunction was codified in the Justinian Institutes.

Thomas Aquinas next brings in another factor. He distinguishes the Lex Naturæ (Natural Law) from the Lex Instituta (Positive Law, or Law by Legal Enactment). This is of two kinds—Lex Humana (Human Law or Laws of States) and Lex Divina (Divine Law, or the Law of the Church). Each in its true being was conformable to the other. The Natural Law was God's law, inherent in the rational mind of His creatures. The Laws of States were just only when they reflected this natural law. The appeal was made from any tyrannical

state back to the law of reason. The Lex Divina (or law directly from God) was held to be in harmony with reason always. It was mediated through the church.

Grotius came in after the breaking up of the Lex Divina by the Protestant Reformation. Religious and political anarchy was rife in all lands. The Inquisition and Thirty Years' War were doing their deadliest work. The mediæval peacemaker, the Pope, had lost his power. The unity of the Roman Empire was gone forever. The old feudal lord was being bowed off the stage by the new absolute monarch. Grotius was a Netherlander, a citizen of that republic just then rising into commercial supremacy. The traders of the wide world are always the most benefitted by peace. What could restore the order and unity of the Mediæval Papacy? At this juncture the patriot and scholar issues a book on "The Rights of War and Peace." Once more he identifies the Lex Naturæ and Jus Gentium. But this time the Jus Gentium was not a law between the individuals of different nations, but between the nations themselves. He wrote the first book on International Law. He laid down the principles by which peace could be possible among peoples and by which the terrors of war could be mitigated. This could happen by a social contract. He looked forward to a "Congress of Christian Powers" in which controversies which arise among some of them may be decided by others who are not interested, and in which measures may be taken to compel the parties to accept peace on equitable terms. In all Grotius' reasonings the Lex Naturæ is the ruling conception. He defines this as "the dictate of Right Reason, indicating that any act, from its agreement or disagreement with the rational (or social) nature (of man), has in it a moral turpitude or a moral necessity, and consequently, such act is forbidden or commanded by God, the author of nature." (Grotius, Whewell 4.)

Now the leap is made from politics to theology. Coccejus identifies this Lex Naturæ with his Fœdus Operum. Chapter II (De Fœdere et Testamento Dei) is an argument for this identification. The two covenants (Fœdus Operum et Fœdus Gratiæ) are also called laws (Lex Operum et Lex Fidei), as works is the method of the one, faith that of the other (Sec. 11). In the case of Adam, the law of works was not written in a book, because Adam being upright and in the image of God, it was written on the tablets of the heart. In fallen man, who thus naturally knew what was right, there remains the testimony of conscience. Meanwhile the tables of covenant and the book of the law do not command different but the same things as the law of nature (Lex Naturæ is the word written in italics). For it is necessary that the law

of works be one. Therefore, the Lex Naturæ and the Decalogue contain the same precepts, or the Lex Naturæ and the Lex Scripta are the same thing (Sec. 13). Hence (I give a literal translation—Sec. 22): "The Covenant of Works, so far as it rests upon the law of Nature, can be called the Covenant of Nature." (Sec. 22. Fœdus Operum quatenus lege Naturæ nititur fœdus Naturæ appellari potest.) "For it is natural that man, endowed with intelligence and will, should be created not without the image of God. I, alongside with the Scriptures, call the image of God that likeness to God by which man agrees and concurs with God that when the same thing is examined, God appears to be his exemplar throughout." (Sec. 22). Hence, Coccejus says: "Man (i. e. after the Fall) condemned through the law of this covenant and shut out from its benefits, yet remains obligated to perform everything which both the Lex Naturæ and God by right of his dominion demand of him." (Sec. 71). Thus throughout the Covenant of Works (Fœdus Operum) is made the basis of Coccejus' system. He knows the Covenant of Grace (Fœdus Gratiæ) only as an abrogation of the same. But the basis of the Covenant of Works is ever the Law of Nature (Lex Naturæ). This is given the same content as in Grotius, Aquinas, Cicero and the Stoics.

Thus, our conclusion may be said to have been fairly well established. The Covenant Idea was formally from the Scriptures, really from the political philosophy of the times. Its use as a category in theology was certainly from the latter source. The motives of Coccejus were like those of his fellow-countryman, Grotius. He was, above all things, a peace-loving man. His problem was one of irenics. He came in the time of the breaking up of the crowning dogma of Predestination, yet he was a loyal son of the Reformed Church. He sought to avert the strifes of the schools and adjust for the purpose of practical piety the old antinomy of divine sovereignty and human responsibility. He sought a mean in which the extremes could meet. He would save from the ethically deadening determinism of Beza, Gomar, on the one side, and the rash enthusiasm and subjectivism of the Anabaptist, Socinian and Arminian, on the other. He was the first of the Reformed theologians to feel the union tendency. He uttered no tirades against the Lutherans. He is more akin to Melanchton than to any other. His Covenant Theology was a new Synergism of its own sort. His greatest antipathy was to the Scholasticism of the times. He was a Humanist of the most pronounced type. His interests were linguistic. He had been taught Hebrew by a Jew. His interpretations were of the literary sort. He never became involved in the dogmatic spirit. How could freedom and vital religion be preserved, Coccejus presented this way

out. It is a Jus Sectarum (Law for the Sects), as Grotius had presented a Jus Gentium (Law for the Nations). He sought a common ground for the interpretation of the Scriptures, and for the realization of the Christian life, in which all could agree. This he found in his Fœdus Dei cum Homine. It was a new return to the law, but to the Law of Nature (Lex Naturæ), which was at the same time the Law of God (Lex Divina). It was a law which could find adequate expression in the practical life. God and man are made to act reciprocally. Each finds his true life in this covenant synergism.

2. The historical influences of this Social Contract or Covenant Idea are traceable in two spheres,—politics and theology. (1) Let us first note the political development. The framework of Grotius' thinking was this: The natural condition of states is war. But peace is preferable. This is possible only if the nations will make a common covenant to keep the peace He lays down the principles of right which must be the basis of such a covenant. This is International Law. It in turn throughout is based on the Law of Nature.

Hobbes, who is next in line, applies the Social Contract to individuals. The natural state of man is a state of war. His ruling impulse is selfishness. When this state becomes unendurable, men come together in a social compact and give over their rights to the sovereign, the Leviathan. Yet this one has made no contract, and is not bound in any way to respect the wishes of the people. Their compact was with one another; they gave over the sovereignty for selfish purposes. The sovereign, too, can consult his own wishes in his conduct. Thus, Hobbes was the great champion of the Divine Right of Kings.

Locke makes an advance on Hobbes. He recognizes the rights of the people. The sovereign, too, has made his contract; he must respect it. If not, there is the divine right of Revolution. Another change is made. The state of nature was not a state of war, but of peace. It was the ideal state,—the Golden Age celebrated in classical literature. Pope sings its glories in the line:

"The state of nature is the reign of God."

Rousseau is next. He laid the emphasis upon the "State of Nature," and said little about the Law of Nature. He raised the cry against civilization; against conventions; against governments of every sort; and pleaded for a return to the primitive simplicity. His cry was negative. It became destructive. He was the Father of the French Revolution; the final vial of wrath poured by Individualism upon all remnants of the mediæval system. His "Contrat Social" was the great book of his day,—1761.

Then came the American Revolution. The Federalist—Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, etc.—was a recension of the principles of Locke and Rousseau. Such sentences as "All men are created equal," "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," "no taxation without representation," etc., are simply the set phrases of the Social Contract theory of the time. Thus the civilization of the New World was prepared for a conception of religion in the terms of the "Contrat Social," and favorably inclined to it by its struggles for liberty and dominant modes of political thought. This was the audience destined by Providence to be addressed by the Campbells and their associates.

(2) The theological development worked alongside. It may be traced in three distinct threads:

a. First is the Covenant note in the common Calvinism. This goes back of Coccejus to the great founder of the Reformed Church himself. In fact, the term was used freely by all the Protestant theologians, especially by Calvin in his common reference to Biblical modes of speech. Thus, he says: "All whom, from the beginning of the world, God adopted as His peculiar people, were taken into *covenant* with Him on the same conditions and under the same bond of doctrine as ourselves" (Institutes Book II, Ch. 10, Sec. 1). This is stated in his chapter on the resemblance of the Old and New Testaments. He is quick to add however, "The covenant made with all the fathers, far from differing from ours, in reality and substance is altogether one and the same with it; only the administration differs." Thus Predestination remains as the ruling conception. The immutability of God is preserved; likewise the determinism. "There is only one rule of piety among the people of God." All variations are only in form and of minor importance. All historical growth of truth and duty is annulled. But it is significant that when Calvin states the relation between God and man as a result of the decrees, he does so in the terms of the covenant. It was only natural that when his followers began to inquire into the particulars of this relation that they should take hold of this idea and find in it a fruitful conception. The Covenant became the *form* and *war-cry* of the Scotch Reformation. It was the nature of the constitution adopted by the members of the early Independent Churches. Besides these applications in the realm of church polity, it was destined to have a wide use in theology. Hyperius, Olevian, Eglin, Amesius and Bullinger appear as the forerunners of Coccejus. Thus the doctrine has always been presented in a mild form and subordinate to the decrees by the theologians of the Reformed Church, especially in Scotland and America. It

was a part of the theological inheritance of all Presbyterians. The early Reformers springing out of this soil could use or reject this product which lay half-grown before them, as they pleased.

b. The second thread is a special connection. William Ames (Amesius), born 1576, died 1633, brought up as a Puritan, educated at Cambridge, became one of the most ardent advocates of Puritanism. Hence he was compelled to flee to Holland during the reign of the Stuarts. Here he met John Robinson; was a member of the Synod of Dort, 1618, at which he took sides against the Remonstrants; and after serving as chaplain in the army was seated as professor of theology at Franeker, 1622. Here he taught Coccejus, and seems to have been the most influential factor in shaping his future destiny. Ames taught the Fœdus Operum in a work called the "Medulla Theologiæ," and seems to have had many friends and sympathizers among the Puritan divines of those stormy times. At least the covenant theologians had a small representation in the Westminster Assembly, and secured the insertion of their favorite tenet in the Westminster Confession of Faith, where it appears with great clearness as Article VII with only the Calvinistic caveat attached,—"There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace differing in substance, but one and the same under various dispensations." (See Schaff—Creeds, Vol III, p. 618).

Among the adherents of Cromwell was one Edward Fisher, who—taking up the title of Ames—wrote the "Marrow of Modern Divinity" (1644). This book, as the sub-title shows ("Touching both the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace; with use and end, both in the time of the Old Testament and in the time of the New"), was a direct statement of the covenant theology for practical purposes. The form of the book was a dialogue between Evangelista, a Minister, Nomista, a Legalist, Antinomista, an Antinomian, and Neophitus, a young Christian. Evangelista represents the author's view, who saw two dangers in the religion of his time,—a strict legalism, on the one hand, and Antinomianism on the other, and states as his purpose "to walk as a middle man between them both."

Calvin had identified the Covenant with the Law, which he in turn divided into three kinds,—Ceremonial Law, Judicial Law, Moral Law or the Decalogue. The first he held to have been done away in Christ, the second to apply only to the Jewish State, while the third is eternal and immutable and binding on the elect. Hence it was only natural that strict Puritanism should fall back on the Decalogue and maintain a rigidity on Sabbath keeping, etc., which Fisher felt to depart from the spirit of Christ and the freedom of grace. Meanwhile many Anglican

divines had gone too far in the other direction, through the incoming Arminianism and Socinianism. Fisher, well learned in the best writers of his day, sought the via media, which naturally enough should be the doctrine of the covenants in a new cloak. The book received little notice, and passed from print, to be revived eighty years later in a strange way.

The scene was now shifted to Scotland, in the General Assembly of 1717. There was no small stir about one John Simson, professor of Glasgow, who was alleged to be Arminian in tendency and who had attacked the doctrine of grace, and who was treated with great leniency by the Assembly. This was followed by discussion of the question, "Which came first; faith or repentance?" raised by some propositions of the Auchterarder Presbytery. The so-called "Auchterarder Creed," which affirmed the priority of faith, was condemned by the Assembly. Many were violently opposed to the action of the majority. Thomas Boston, Minister of Etterick, one of the minority, told a friend that he had once read a book which would throw much light on the question. This book was the "Marrow of Modern Divinity," by Edward Fisher (Boston's Memoirs, p. 291). When a young minister, and much troubled about the doctrine of grace, he chanced upon a copy of the "Marrow" in one of the houses of his parish, which had been brought from England by a soldier who had served in Cromwell's wars. He read the book with great satisfaction for the time, but later dismissed it from his mind (Ibid 155). Now the book was brought to the light, and republished by James Hog, 1718. This occasioned a great controversy in the Scottish Church, over what was known as the "Marrow Movement." A great hue and cry was raised against Antinomianism, which the book was alleged to teach. Mr. Hog and friends were called before the Assembly's committee. Upon their refusal to retract, some propositions were culled from the book and condemned by the Assembly, 1720 (Ibid 318). Upon this, twelve prominent ministers prepared a "Representation," protesting against the action of the Assembly, and claiming that these propositions culled from the book by its enemies did not fairly represent its teaching (Ibid 324). Among these were Thomas Boston, James Hog, Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine. But after a bitter disputation, they received for their pains only the rebuke of the Assembly, to which they submitted and the affair was ended (Ibid 333). But, like most controversies it left each party with firmer convictions. As true Scotchmen, Boston and his friends were not lax in holding and advocating their beliefs. A new edition of the "Marrow" was published, with notes by Thomas Boston (see Boston's Works, Vol. VII). And

this writer incorporated in his great book "Human Nature in Its Fourfold State," a comprehensive view of the Covenant Theology.

In 1732 occurred the Great Secession from the Established Church. Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine were the leaders. Illness and death had doubtless only saved Thomas Boston from being one of their number. His book and doctrine were exceedingly popular among the Seceders. It was read by Alexander Campbell with avidity while yet a boy (Rich. Mem. I, 99; Harb. 30, 137).

Thus a still stronger statement of the covenant teaching was a main element in the special inheritance of the Campbells in the Scottish Sect in which they were nurtured.

c. The third thread is the direct one. The works of the Covenant Theologians of Holland were read in the original Latin and in translations by the scholars of the English Nation (Rich. Mem. I, 27). Especially was this true of Witsius—"The Economy of the Covenants"—whose book had been translated and was a common text-book in academies for the education of ministers. Boston knew and used this work; likewise Mr. Campbell was acquainted with it, and could draw from direct sources this historic doctrine.

III. There remains simply the proof of the use of the Covenant Theology by Alexander Campbell, and the estimate of its influence on the Current Reformation.

That Alexander Campbell was a Covenant Theologian is evident both from his life and his teachings:

1. His first published production was the Sermon on the Law (see Harb. 46, 493; Young's Hist. Doc., 217). In this sermon he made a contrast between the Old and New Testaments on the familiar lines of the Covenant Theology. He recognized the Lex Naturæ (see Harb. 46, 519; Young's Hist. Doc., 277). He attacked the popular division of the Law into moral, ceremonial and judicial, as unscriptural and unwarranted. He held that the Law was given to the Jews, and designed only for them; that the Christian is not even subject to the Ten Commandments, only so far as they are enjoined by Christ; that there is no necessity for preaching the Law in order to prepare men for receiving the Gospel, but that the sole rule of the Christian life is the Word of Christ (see C. B., 40). It is no wonder that this message should be offensive to the stiff Calvinists of the Redstone Association. Mr. Campbell recognized in the sermon itself that the old charge of Antinomianism would be brought against him (Harb. 46, 510, 521; C. B., 39), and was willing that it should be so. Thus we see the historic rise of one of the popular objections to the teachings of Mr. Campbell

and his friends—that "they reject the Old Testament" and the root from which it came, viz.: the Covenant Doctrine. This sermon was a matter of the utmost moment in the personal experiences of its author. He says of it thirty years later (Harb. 46, 493): "This unfortunate sermon afterwards involved me in a seven years' war with some members of said Association, and became a matter of much debate.....It is therefore highly probable, to my mind, that but for the persecution begun on the alleged heresy of this sermon whether the present reformation had ever been advocated by me." This position was one of the points in controversy which led to the later separation from the Baptists (C. B. 575, Life of Smith 376).

Enlarged, in a great discourse on the Progress of Revelation, it was used by Mr. Campbell on all star occasions in his itineraries (Hay. 35; Rich. Mem. II, 164, 168; Harb. 49, 46), throughout his life. In the earliest period his illustrations of this theme were full-grown, and the different dispensations were depicted as the starlight, moonlight, twilight and sunlight ages of the world (McCalla Deb., 125; C. B., 495). He incorporated it in the Confession of the Wellsburg Church, 1824 (Hay. 32), and acted it out in his atttitude on the "Sabbath Question" (Rich. Mem. 1, 432-5), for which he attacked the Moral Societies of Western Pennsylvania (Rich. Mem. 1, 522-37). He stated his doctrine most fully in his "Essays on Man in the Primitive State, and under the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian Dispensations" in the Christian Baptist (463, 470, 484, 494, 503, 511, 521, 542, 559, 574, 589, 633, 637, 646, 654, 656). Likewise, the Covenant Theology entered as a constructive factor in the Debates of Mr. Campbell. In the earliest debate, that with Walker, the covenants were the main article of contention. The subject was introduced by Mr. Walker, who took as his chief thesis—"that Baptism came in the room of Circumcision;" "that the covenant on which the Jewish Church was built, and to which Circumcision is the seal, is the same with the covenant on which the Christian Church is built and to which Baptism is the seal" (Walker Deb. 9). Mr. Campbell met this position by showing seven differences between Baptism and Circumcision (Ibid 12), and by distinguishing two Abrahamic covenants,—the covenant of circumcision (Gen. 17), given to Abraham at one hundred years of age, and referred to by Stephen (Acts 7:8), and the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ (Gen. 12:3), given at 75 years of age and so called by Paul (Gal. 3:17) (Ibid 13, 19, 20). He affirmed that on these two covenants two dispensations were founded,—the Jewish and the Christian (Ibid 20). This debate consisted of threshing back and forth over this ground until an estoppel was put on this procedure by the mod-

erators (Ibid 96). Mr. Campbell thus added a supplement to what he had been able to say in the debate in the essay on the "Covenants," published in the appendix to the volume (Ibid 153, 174). This was the first systematic statement of his thinking, and shows plainly that he had a clear understanding of the Covenant theology at the beginning. Mr. Walker even hurled the old charge of Antinomianism at him in this first combat (Ibid 47, 141, 221). A like prominence is given to this doctrine in all his discussions, and it received final statement in the volume entitled "Christian Baptism" (pp. 89-115).

Let us now make a brief sketch of Mr. Campbell's doctrine of the covenants. We shall draw mainly from the Walker Debate and "Christian Baptism."

"The Universe is one grand system, the result of a well-matured plan, the consummation of a previously existing scheme" (Chr. Bap'm 89). This plan or scheme is its constitution, according to which the universe performs all its operations under uniform law. Man, as a part of the universe, has thus his constitution moral as well as physical. *"And there must be some supreme constitution, or law, or covenant,* by which his Sovereign and himself can understand each other and maintain perpetual amity. He may honor the God that made him, or make a god for himself. A god he must have. *And he may accept a constitution or covenant from God, or make one with Satan and ruin. A covenant he must have."* (Ibid 91.) This term is thus defined: Amongst men we have covenants. In these there are parties. One may sometimes be the covenanter, the other the covenantee. The former propounds, the latter accepts the stipulation. These terms are, however, seldom used. Both parties are most generally both covenanters and covenantees. They both stipulate and restipulate. Such covenants are agreements, or bonds entered into between two or more parties on certain terms. Such the Greeks call a "suntheke," the Latins a "fœdus," we a covenant, because that word literally indicates a coming together, an agreement. With us, indeed, a constitution or a form of government, because an agreement on certain principles between the government and the citizens, is to all intents and purposes a covenant' (Ibid 92). But the covenant between God and man is a diatheke (διαθήκη), not a suntheke (συνθήκη), God is so far above man in rank and nature as to propound all the terms of the covenant, to which man must accede in order to participate in the benefits proposed. Each covenant has four elements (1) the command; (2) the promise; (3) the penalty; (4) the seal (Walker Deb., 154). Mr. Campbell rejected the term "Covenant of Works" as unbib-

lical, and built alone a progressive series of covenants. (Chr. Bap'm 20, 93). These were:

1. Covenant with Adam (Hos. 6:7), in which the relations of the human race to their Creator were defined and the conditions of future happiness marked out. In this covenant, the command was the prohibition of the forbidden fruit; the promise, continuance in the life of Eden; the penalty, death; and the seal, the tree of life. This original charter was a necessity of divine government. It was a test of human loyalty (C. B. 470).

2. Covenant with Noah; in which Noah, as the founder of the Post-diluvian world received the guarantee of the continuance of that state. It had no command, and hence no penalty, but was all promise. Its seal was the rainbow.

3. Covenant with Abraham at seventy-five years of age (Gen. 12:4), called "Covenant confirmed of God in Christ" (Gal. 3:8-17). This contained two promises; one respecting the natural offspring of Abraham—"I will make of thee a great nation"—and one respecting the seed Christ—"In thee shall all nations be blessed." This was the gospel preached to Abraham; the prototype of the New Covenant. This was followed by two subordinate covenants growing therefrom.

4. Covenant with Abraham at eighty-six years of age (Gen. 15), by which an inheritance was promised to his family, and was confirmed by a sacrifice.

5. Covenant with Abraham at ninety-nine years of age (Gen. 17), by which a special providence was secured to his descendants and was confirmed by circumcision. Hence it was called "Covenant of Circumcision" (Acts 7:8). These two covenants were later developed into a great national institution, viz.:

6. Covenant with all Israel at Sinai (Exod. 19-20), by which the Jewish state was constituted. This was identical with the Ten Commandments, to which other laws were attached, as the laws of a land to the constitution of the same. It is called the "Old Covenant," or sometimes merely the *Law*. It was confirmed by appropriate sacrifices. Its mediator was Moses. Its type was Hagar. It led to bondage. It gave only temporal blessings, and was appropriately conditioned.

7. Covenant with Aaron (Exod. 40:13-5), by which the priesthood was promised to his family.

8. Covenant with David (2 Sam. 7:12-7), by which the scepter of Israel was confirmed to his seed.

9. New Covenant. He says (Chr. Bap'm 100): *"The gospel is,*

indeed, presented in the form of a covenant. The Messiah seals it as his covenant—"the new." "the better," "the everlasting covenant." He is himself both the covenant and the Mediator of it, as he is himself the victim, the altar, and the priest. *We are said to be "in Christ;" but before we are in him, we must come into him by covenant.* He is the oath of God accomplished, and we take the vow; God is the covenanter, Christ the covenant, and we the covenantees; we are reconciled to God through him. He sealed the covenant with his own blood. The Lord's supper is the pledge of it. But he will have us to die, to be buried, and to rise again for him, as he died, was buried, and rose again for us. *Hence the institution of Christian baptism.* We must pass through the solemn sign, and must lie with him in the grave and rise with him to a new and better life. *These are outward signs of an inward and true and real covenant with the Lord,* by and through which we individually, each one for himself, are made partakers of the fullness of the blessings of the gospel of Christ."

Thus, upon this framework of nine covenants, Mr. Campbell constructed an elaborate Biblical Theology. He had no other system, and he was accustomed to confound his opponents by his ready reference to the Scriptures and by the use of their authority on his side. He was also in the habit of singling out the covenants which concentrate in the Jewish Institution and those which develop into the Christian Institution, and then contrasting them as "flesh and spirit," necessity and liberty, type and reality, shadow and substance, Law and Gospel, the Old and the New Testaments. He held that the latter alone was binding on the Christian, and that the Old Testament was abolished in so far as it was not re-enacted in Christ. (Chr. Bap'm 102-15).

This distinction of nine covenants on Biblical grounds was the real classification of Mr. Campbell; but he also fell back on the older division into dispensations when he had occasion to do so. (C. B. 495, Chr. Bap'm 60). These are the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian dispensations. They contrast as the starlight, moonlight and sunlight ages of the world.

Thus, when Mr. Campbell gave answer to the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" he did so in the strict terminology of the covenant idea. Religion, which is the means of restoration of fallen man to his lost estate, consists of two parts: (1) What God has done for us; (2) What we must do for ourselves. (Chr. Sys. 36). Three things are done for us. Christ our passover has been sacrificed. He has become our prophet; he has been made Lord. All are summed up in the gift of Jesus, our Mediator as prophet, priest and king. Other things are

promised to be done, but these are done already (Chr. Sys. 54-5). The things done by us are likewise three, viz.: Faith in Christ, Repentance, and Baptism into His name (Chr. Sys. 55-67; Chr. Bap'm 115). At this point another gift comes from God—the Holy Spirit (Chr. Sys. 68). This continues as our helper and guide, to which our duty is to respond by walking in the Christian Life.

But the most evident dependence on the Covenant Theology is Mr. Campbell's philosophy of baptism. This, stated in his own terms, is (Chr. Bap'm 117): "Besides, it (baptism) is a peculiar and *positive ordinance. All admit that baptism is a positive ordinance;* and that *positive precepts,* as contradistinguished from *moral precepts, indicate the special will of a sovereign in some exact and well-defined action,* the nature, form and necessity of which arise not from our own *a priori* reasonings about utility of expediency, *but from the clearly-expressed will of the lawgiver.* It is farther universally agreed that circumcision was a positive and not a moral institution, made right and obligatory by the mere force of a positive law." This was the chief premise to his argument on both the subject and action of baptism. As arising from the express will of a lawgiver, it must have been a specific precept enjoining a specific action. Hence, it could not have come in the room of circumcision; no other action could be substituted for it, as sprinkling, pouring, etc. This distinction between positive and moral precepts clearly dates back to the Lex Naturæ and Lex Instituta of Thomas Aquinas (See p. 37), and is found in all political and theological theories since that time (See Grotius' "De Jure Belli et Pacis," Chapter I, Secs. 2, 9 and 10).

Campbell thus cites the current doctrine in his Debate with Walker, p. 45: "We have often heard that Divine Commandments or Ordinances have been correctly divided into two classes; by some called moral natural and moral positive; by others, merely moral and positive. When these distinctions are explained in the following sense (which we believe to be the true meaning of the distinction), we consider them scripturally correct. By moral positive, or positive, we understand those that depend entirely for their moral obligation upon some express precept of the Deity; the propriety of which nature, in its most perfect state, could not discover. The prohibition of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; the appointment of sacrifice; of resting on the Sabbath or seventh day, were of this nature. * * * * Moral precepts are such as respect our duty to our fellow creatures, and are in some degree more or less discernible by mankind even now, and were perfectly so previous to the fall, merely by the light of nature. Thus, for instance,

Adam in Paradise, without a law, knew that it was right to love his wife, to cherish and protect her as himself. And now, though fallen, men perceive such virtues as truth, honesty and common justice to be, in the nature of things, necessary and right. Though they may differ much in the extent and accuracy of their views on these topics, yet they must perceive, in some degree at least, that they are in themselves right. Of the heathen, the apostle saith: 'Their conscience bearing them witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.' (Rom. 2:15)."

The two classes are contrasted:

"In positive institutions, the obligation is altogether in the command; but in moral duties the obligation is not only in the command but also in the nature of things. Hence, it has been correctly said, the former are right because they are commanded, and the latter are commanded because they are right. In positive institutions, the Divine authority commanding is that which the subject views in his obedience; in moral precepts, he views also the rational and moral use and beauty of the duty commanded. In positive institutions, we are not authorized to reason what we should do, but implicitly to obey. 'See [said God to Moses] that thou make all things to the pattern shewed thee in the Mount.' Not whether it be rational or proper to do so; but go, do it. In moral requirements we are clearly shewn and commanded to perform certain duties, but left at liberty to reason, to ascertain in what these duties consist."

Thus Baptism was placed in a category apart from faith and repentance and the ordinary acts of the Christian life. It had a peculiar place in the Christian system. Like the command "not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," it was placed at the beginning of a new state; as a test of obedience and trial of loyalty to God (C. B. 470, Chr. Sys. 28). This test was sufficient to determine one's whole character. Compliance with this precept meant the acceptance of the Covenant of Christ. This explains the immense importance attached to Baptism by Mr. Campbell, and the cardinal place it has always had in the practice of the Disciples of Christ.

Thus the influence of Mr. Campbell's covenant theology is evident:

1. He appeared with this doctrine on the frontier of America, among the Presbyterians and Baptists, the strong supporters of Calvinism in this country. It was only natural that his teachings of the progress of revelation, of freedom from the Law, of the importance of Baptism, should awaken intense hostility. Its issue was inevitable.

2. He also represented the time-spirit (Zeitgeist) of the American

Republic. He came in line with the great social and political movements of his day. He was the voice of democracy, of individualism in the religious sphere. This was one secret of his power. His answer to the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" in the terms of the covenant was easy to be understood. It appealed to one's sense of self and of his civic relations. It avoided the fatalism, the pessimism, the mysticism of the Eighteenth Century calls to the unconverted. It called forth one's own initiative, gave specific demands for action, and a prompt and ready assurance to him who sought the way of the Lord. Its advocate was popular in speech, powerful in debate; the common people heard him gladly.

3. Here also is evident the Legalism with which the followers of Mr. Campbell have often been reproached. This is not of the Jewish sort, a law of external details, not Mosaism. It is not of the Romish sort,—a law of merit by works—not from the Roman law. But it is from Modern Law—Grotius, Locke, Rousseau—the social contract, the covenant as a basis of all relations. Religion is made such a contract. The temptation is to make a good bargain—to get as much and give as little as possible. It is Commercialism. We must bear in mind the spirit of trade out of which these concepts were born far back in the Netherlands. We must admit that this legalism lies as the greatest danger of the Current Reformation, and seek to correct any tendency thereto by a vital religious experience, and by a grasp of the gospel of the grace of God, as was held by Mr. Campbell and the founders of this movement.

CHAPTER III.

The Philosophy of Locke.

In Great Britain the Reformation brought no theological movements of importance. The theology of the island was but a reflection of the thought of the continent. All the schools were represented—Lutheran, Calvinist, Arminian, Coccejan. In Scotland Calvinism gained the ascendancy, due to John Knox. But the Anglican Church ever held a mediating position. The English mind is practical. The interest was not in theology but in church polity. Hence, the dividing lines were between Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists. It is in another sphere—PHILOSOPHY—that we are to see the real importance of English thought.

In Modern Philosophy, up to the nineteenth century, there were two great movements—the English and the Continental. The first is called Empiricism. Its motto was, "There is nothing in the intellect which was not first in the senses." Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume made the series. The second school is Rationalism. Its motto was, "The laws of thought are the laws of things." Its method was reasoning, deduction. Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Wolff, were its leaders. Kant marks the union of the two and the beginning of a new era.

Let us examine the work of the two great leaders of these series as a preparation for that of John Locke, in whom we have the immediate interest.

Bacon broke away from the Aristotelian logic and the Scholastic systems of his predecessors, and called men's attention from words to things. To know the truth of the objects about us, he said, let us look at them—not reason about them. His appeal was to observation and to induction from the facts. He was the father of inductive logic and the modern scientific method.

Descartes, likewise, broke away from the world-content given in Scholasticism; and called back from the objective to the subjective, from the complex to the simple. He said: "Let us doubt everything until we find that simple state of consciousness which cannot be doubted; from this starting point let us build *de novo* the world of knowledge. In this process we shall accept as true only that which comes to us with the

same clear and evident conviction as the axioms of mathematics." In this science Descartes was eminent before he began his studies in philosophy. He now sought to apply his old method to work in the new sphere.

His first proposition was "Dubito" (I doubt). But then he said, "Non potior dubitare me dubitantem" (I cannot doubt that I doubt). At least I must be certain of one thing—that I am doubting, or of the existence of the doubter, i. e., I know that I doubt. Or, to put it in a positive form: "Cogito, ergo sum" (I think, that is, I am). This was the central proposition of his whole system. From this point he said: I am certain

(1) Of Self-Existence.

(2) Of the existence of God.

The argument is as follows:

I have an idea of God. It is the idea of an absolutely perfect being. As perfect it contains all qualities. One of these qualities is existence. Hence God must exist. This is the first form of the famous Ontological argument.

(3) Of the existence of the world.

I have certain ideas of things. I do not produce these ideas. They are independent of my will. Hence, God must produce them. But God as perfect cannot deceive. Hence, things must exist.

Hence, we have three realities:

(1) God—the Absolute substance.

(2) Ego (or soul),—the thinking substance.

(3) World (things),—the extended substance.

Correspondingly, there are three kinds of ideas:

(1) Innate,
As God, self, mathematical axioms, etc.

(2) Adventitious,
which come in from without, as of the things of the world.

(3) Self-produced
by combination of those given by the other sources.

These were the first gleams of the light of Modern Philosophy. Bacon and Descartes were children of the dawn only. Locke took over the insights of these early seers and went on to new problems. He combined the Empiricism of Bacon with the Subjectivism of Descartes. Let us make a brief sketch of this thinker.

John Locke, the greatest character of English philosophy, was born at Wrington, England, 1632, of Puritan parentage. He was educated

at Oxford. He led a troublous life during the wars of Cromwell, and later settled as a physician at Oxford. There (1667) he met the Earl of Shaftesbury, with whose political fortunes his future was to be so much identified. As attache to the earl, he held various offices. In 1670 he began work on his "Essay on the Human Understanding." In 1672 he was made Lord Chancellor. In the midst of the cares of state he worked at his book. In 1681, Shaftesbury, who had been thrown into prison, escaped into Holland. Locke, being under suspicion, soon followed. There Shaftesbury died in exile. Locke met Limborck and the scholars of the Netherlands. On the accession of William and Mary, in 1688, he returned home. He brought with him the manuscript of the "Essay," which was published in 1690. The origin of this epoch-making book has been well stated by its author:

> "Were it fit to trouble thee with the history of this Essay, I should tell thee that five or six friends meeting at my chamber and discoursing on a *subject very remote from this,* found themselves quickly at a stand by the difficulties that rose on every side. After we had a while puzzled ourselves without coming any nearer a resolution of those doubts which perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took a wrong course; and that before we set ourselves upon inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to *examine our own abilities,* and *see what objects our understandings were, or were not, fitted to deal with.* This I proposed to the company, who all readily assented; and thereupon it was agreed that this should be our first inquiry. Some hasty and undigested thoughts on a subject I had never before considered, which I set down against our next meeting, gave me the first entrance into this Discourse; which, having been thus begun by chance, was continued by entreaty; written by incoherent parcels; and after long intervals of neglect, resumed again, as my humor or occasions permitted; and at last, in a retirement where an attendance on my health gave me leisure, it was brought into the order that thou now seest it."

James Tyrrell, who was one of the company, wrote in his copy of Locke that the difficulties in question were the "principles of morality and revealed religion."

Thus the spring of Locke's book is to be found in his religious interests. Its outcome will show his final purpose. Let us make a brief analysis of this wonderful book.

Locke's problem was the theory of knowledge; to inquire into the original (origin), certainty and extent of human knowledge, together

with the grounds and degrees of belief, opinion and assent (Essay on Human Understanding, Int. Secs. 2 and 3). This problem was threefold:

1. The Origin of Knowledge.
2. The degrees of certainty in the various kinds of knowledge.
3. The Limits of Knowledge.

Locke's answer to the first question was his famous *tabula rasa.* He denied the existence of innate ideas, and devoted Book I to a bitter polemic against Cudworth, More, etc., the English disciples of Descartes. He says (Book II, Chap. 1, Secs. 2, 3 and 4:

"Let us then suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas:— How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it by that vast store which the busy and boundless fancy of man has painted on it with an almost endless variety? Whence has it all the *materials* of reason and knowledge? To this I answer in one word, from EXPERIENCE. In that all our knowledge is founded; and from that it ultimately derives itself. Our observation employed either about external, sensible objects, or about the internal operations of our minds perceived and reflected on by ourselves, is that which supplies our understandings with all the *materials* of thinking. These two are the fountains of knowledge, from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring.

First, our senses, conversant about particular sensible objects, do convey into the mind several distinct perceptions of things, according to those various ways wherein those objects do affect them. . . . This great source of most ideas we have, depending wholly upon our senses and derived by them to the understanding, I call SENSATION.

Secondly, the other fountain from which experience furnisheth the understanding with ideas is,—the perception of the operations of our own mind within us, as it is employed about the ideas it has got; which operations, when the soul comes to reflect on and consider, do furnish the understanding with another set of ideas, which could not be had from things without. . . . This source of ideas every man has wholly in himself; and though it be not sense, as having nothing to do with external objects, yet it is very like it, and might properly enough be called *internal sense.* But as I call the other Sensation, I call this REFLECTION, the ideas it affords being such only as the mind gets by reflecting on its own operations within itself. . . . These two, I say, viz.: external, material things, as the objects of SENSATION, and the operation of our minds within, as the objects of REFLECTION, are to me the only originals from whence all our ideas take their beginnings."

Thus Locke held that the mind was passive in knowing; that it began with nothing; that all knowledge comes from without, in. He was a thoroughgoing Empiricist. A few definitions will help us to understand this philosophy.

An *Idea* is whatever it is which the mind can be employed about in thinking (Int. Sec. 8). It is thus a general term for the crude materials of thought. It is the product of any sense or internal perception, or of any previous mental activity. It is any "notion." Ideas are thus of two kinds,—simple and complex (Book II, Chap. 2, Sec. 1). Simple ideas are the products of mere sensation and reflection. Complex ideas are formed by combination of simple ideas by means of the power of Imagination. This is the source of all general ideas in the mind. These are of three kinds,—modes, substances and relations. All these *ideas* are to be distinguished from *knowledge*.

Knowledge is "the perception of the connexion of—and agreement or disagreement or repugnancy of—any of our ideas" (Book IV, Chap. 1, Sec. 2). This agreement or disagreement may be of four kinds,—a. Identity. b. Relation. c. Coexistence. d. Real existence.

This leads us to Locke's second question,—the degrees of knowledge. These arise from "the different way of perception the mind has of the agreement or disagreement of any of its ideas" (Book IV, Chap. 2, Sec. 1). When the mind perceives the agreement (or disagreement) of two ideas immediately by themselves we have *intuitive knowledge*. This kind of knowledge is irresistible—seeing is believing—and forms the most certain conviction possible. Secondly, when the perception is made "by the introduction of other ideas" we have *demonstrative knowledge*. This process is called Reasoning. It is not so certain as intuition, —a cog may be slipped in the connection. Locke concludes (Book IV, Chap. 2, Sec. 14):

> "These two, viz., intuition and demonstration, are the degrees of our knowledge; whatever comes short of one of these, with what assurance soever embraced, is but faith or opinion, but not knowledge, at least in all general truths."

Thus a distinction is made between knowledge proper, which gives certainty, and Judgment or Assent, which gives only probability (Book IV, Chap. 14, Sec. 4). This latter is employed in all cases where direct or demonstrative knowledge cannot be had, or the mind is too lazy to see for itself. In these cases, the agreement (or disagreement) of ideas, instead of being perceived is merely *presumed*. Hence, the conviction is only that of probability, likelihood to be true. This falls into two classes, —Belief and Opinion (Book IV, Chap. 15, Secs. 3 and 4). Belief is the

acceptance of the testimony of others. It deals with matters of fact, capable of observation, but without the circle of our personal knowledge. Its credibility depends upon a number of circumstances, as the number, integrity, skill and design of the witnesses, the consistency of its parts and contrary testimonies. When dealing with matters generally accepted among men, it approaches near to certainty. This is the type of judgment possible in history. Opinion is a judgment due to the conformity of anything to our own knowledge, observation and experience. It deals with things beyond the reach of our senses, and hence not capable of observation or testimony. It is judgment by analogy.

Thus Locke arranges the degrees of knowledge on a descending scale:

I. Certainty.
  1. Intuition.
  2. Demonstration.
II. Probability.
  3. Belief.
  4. Opinion.

Belief and Opinion are at the bottom of this scale of credibility. Over this whole process he writes the word—*Reason.* Reason is the discovery of truth by the use of our natural faculties (Book IV, Chap. 18, Sec. 2). But Locke takes care not to stop before he has marked out a great class of subject matter as an exception to the above rule, and not bound by its scale of credibility (Book IV, Chap. 16, Sec. 14):

> "Besides those we have hitherto mentioned there is one sort of propositions that challenge the highest degree of our assent, upon bare testimony, whether the thing proposed agree or disagree with common experience and the ordinary course of things, or no. The reason whereof is, because the testimony is of such an one as cannot deceive nor be deceived: and that is, God himself. This carries with it an assurance beyond doubt, evidence beyond exception. This is called by a peculiar name, REVELATION, and our assent to it, FAITH, which (as absolutely determines our minds and as perfectly excludes all wavering) as our knowledge itself; and we may as well doubt of our own being, as we can whether any revelation from God be true. So that faith is a settled and sure principle of assent and assurance and leaves no manner of room for doubt or hesitation. *Only we must be sure that it be a divine revelation, and that we understand it right:* else we shall expose ourselves to to all the extravagance of enthusiasm, and all the error of

wrong principles, if we have faith and assurance in what is not divine revelation."

Thus Faith is the assent to any proposition, not made by the deductions of reason but upon the credit of its proposer, as coming from God, in some extraordinary way of communication. This way of discovering truths to men is called Revelation. Thus faith in a Revelation is set over against Reason in exercise upon the objects of natural sense. Locke affirms a complete "duality of knowledge," but he does not leave the separate spheres unrelated. His doctrine is no "Credo quia incredibilis est." "No man inspired by God can by any revelation communicate to others any new simple ideas which they had not before from sensation or reflection." Revelation can come only by words or signs. These can go no further than man has ideas corresponding to them. Thus only the same truths may be discovered and conveyed down from revelation which are discoverable to us by reason and by those ideas we naturally have. Faith is not a sixth sense, but only the five senses raised into a higher sphere. Faith must not contradict Reason.

> "Because, though faith be founded on the testimony of God (who cannot lie) revealing any proposition to us: yet we cannot have an assurance of its being a divine revelation greater than our own knowledge. Since the whole strength of the certainty depends upon our *knowledge that God revealed it.* . . .For if the mind of man can never have a clearer (and perhaps not so clear) evidence of anything to be a divine revelation, as it has of the principles of its own reason, it can never have a ground to quit the clear evidence of its reason, to give a place to a proposition whose revelation has not a greater evidence than these principles have."

Thus also his doctrine is no "Credo ut intelligam." It is, on the other hand, an "Intelligo ut credam." We must know that God revealed it and that we interpret it aright. To secure this, Locke affirms the complete reasonableness of Revelation. The proper matters of Faith are those above Reason. Reason is natural revelation; Revelation is Reason writ large. Thus Locke's outcome shows that he reached his goal—the vindication of the "principles of morality and revealed religion." His Essay is worthy the study of anyone who takes a serious view of life.

Let us omit the study of the limits of knowledge.

We shall not undertake to trace the historical outcome of this philosophy. It is sufficient to say that Locke was the father of all that follows: of Bishop Butler and Alexander Campbell, whose proofs of Chris-

tianity were based on Lockean premises; of Berkeley and Hume, whose Idealism and Skepticism were but the driving to their logical conclusions of certain distinctions of Locke; of Kant, whose Critical Philosophy had its most important root in English Empiricism; of Newton and Laplace, who applied the principles of Locke's theory of knowledge to the problems of natural science; of the English Deists and Voltaire, who accepted the distinction between Reason and Faith but denied the reality of any *revelation*. To sketch these disparate offsprings would be to write the history of modern philosophy. This is not necessary, as the connection between Locke and the Current Reformation is a direct one. Mr. Campbell fell back on Locke, and combatted most bitterly the conclusions of most of his successors.

The work of Locke really brought forth a new science, viz: Psychology. Lockeanism has been taught ever since in colleges all over the English-speaking world until within the last generation, under the title of "mental philosophy." But to-day it is supplanted in most higher institutions of learning by Kantianism or some form of German philosophy. Thus Lockean Empiricism remains fixed as the soil of mental, moral and religious philosophy, on which the Current Reformation arose.

There remains only the proof of the dependence of the leaders of this movement on the popular philosophy for the forms in which they couched their message, and the significance of the same for the success or failure of the cause for which they pleaded. We shall limit this proof to two arguments. The first may be called the external evidence, and consists in showing the acquaintance with Locke seen in Mr. Campbell's works, and the respect paid to him therein. The second proof, or internal evidence, will be the showing of a correspondence between the two thinkers on the primary topics discussed by them.

I. Alexander Campbell studied the writings of Locke carefully, as a part of his early education (Rich. Mem. I, 33-4). He always held him in the highest esteem. He calls him the "Christian philosopher" par excellence (C. B. 82; Owen Deb. 262). In all his lists of illustrious men he gives Locke a prominent place (Harb. 30, 42; Purcell Deb. 329). As in Harb. 30, 51: "If Paul, Peter, Wickliffe, Luther, Milton, *Locke*, Newton, Franklin, Washington were to appear among us." He confesses agreement with him in questions of philosophy (C. B. 662; Owen Deb. 50), in his interpretations of the Scriptures (C. B. 194; Harb. 32, 274), and in his efforts toward Christian Union (Harb. 44, 12; Owen Deb. 262). He makes many excerpts from the works of Locke (See C. B. 194, 373-4; Owen Deb. 121; Harb. 32, 274; Harb. 36, 253, 463, 589; Harb. 44 ,12, etc.). He is never sparing in his tributes.

II. But the agreement is best made out by the correspondence of the two in many essential points of doctrine:

1. Theory of Knowledge. Mr. Campbell took a firm stand for the *tabula rasa* conception of the origin of knowledge. This is best seen in the Debate with Owen, his work on the evidences of Christianity. He prepared for this discussion by a study of the history of philosophy, especially of the skeptical systems of the Eighteenth Century (Owen Deb. 48, 63, 164). He made his first argument on an analysis of the powers of the human mind. Referring to Locke, Hume, etc., he said (Ibid 50):

> "They all agree that all our original ideas are the results of sensation and reflection; that is, that the five senses inform us of the properties of bodies, that our five senses are the only avenues through which ideas of material objects can be derived to us; that we have an intellectual power of comparing these impressions thus derived to us through the media of the senses; and this they call reflection. Admitting this theory to be correct (Mr. Owen has doubted it), but if it be correct, that all our simple ideas are the result of sensation and reflection, how can we have any idea the archetype of which does not exist in nature?"
>
> (See Ibid 76, 89).

But the idea of God and his creating power has no archetype in nature. It was not received through the senses. It could not be originated with the imagination, for this has only power to combine ideas already given through sensation and reflection (Ibid 51). But we must admit that all nations have the idea of the First Great Cause. How did it come to them? Only through some original revelation. This is true of all the supernatural ideas developed by the Christian religion (Ibid 89). Hence the necessity of an immediate and direct revelation. This left only a second task,—to prove that "we have reasonable grounds to believe the truth and certainty of the apostolic testimony." This testimony consists of matters of fact, and is to be tested by the criteria of all historical evidence (Ibid 173-5). By this process Mr. Campbell seeks to prove the credibility of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, and thereby the truth of Christianity.

It is striking that the major premise of this notable argument was the Empirical Philosophy of Locke and Hume. It was given with due acknowledgment of its source, and taken as a position universally accepted by the intelligent world. This theory of knowledge is evident in all psychological references of Mr. Campbell (C. B. 82, 375, 594; Chr.

Bap'm 291-4). There are no innate ideas. All knowledge comes from without, in. As he says (Chr. Bap'm 25):

"The links in this divine chain of moral and spiritual instrumentality are, therefore, five,—*facts, testimony, faith, feeling, action;* the end of which is salvation. The whole revelation of God is arranged upon this theory or view of man's constitution."

This leads to a second correspondence:

2. Origin of Language. In accordance with this theory of knowledge, Mr. Campbell held that human speech is not natural, but imitative; that, like the ideas of God, priest, sacrifice, etc., it came of divine origin, and that all later languages came from the corruption of this original. This theory of language appeared as the premise to the second argument of the Owen Debate (155-9), which he sums up (Ibid 165):

"We have shown that speech is neither natural to man nor the invention of man; that infants must be taught to speak by a slow and regular process; that names are applied to things and ideas in consequence of the pre-existence of the ideas in the mind; that the idea must always necessarily precede the name, and that we have experimental proof from infants, from those born deaf and subsequently restored to hearing."

It appears also as a proof of the probability of a revelation in the "Christian Baptism," p. 38.

"*God, then, must have taught man to speak viva voce;* inasmuch as language is only an imitation of distinct intelligible sounds; and as all language comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of another (*for the deaf have no words, though they have organs of pronunciation*), we must, in all reason, conclude that the first human speaker had heard God himself speak.

"No class of linguists, rhetoricians, or philosophers, has ever been able to explain the origin of language on the principles of human nature. They agree on one point, viz., that it was not originally a *conventional* thing; that no company of men could assemble to discuss or decide upon it; which is, if properly comprehended, an unanswerable proof of a superhuman origin. So, with the immortal Newton, we conclude that '*God gave* to man reason and religion by giving him the use of words.'"

Hence, then, if God has spoken to man, it is probable that he still so speaks, i. e., by way of a revelation.

It is needless to say that this doctrine, like the above, is the direct outgrowth of the Empirical Philosophy. It is expressly so stated in Book III "On Words" in Locke's Essay. It bears an important function

in the conception of both faith and revelation of Locke and Campbell.

3. Distinction between knowledge, belief and opinion. This is stated also in the Owen Debate (68), where Mr. Campbell takes his opponent to task for a confusion of terms:

> "I am apprehensive that he (Mr. Owen) confounds or uses interchangeably the terms belief, knowledge and opinion. Belief always depends upon the testimony of others; knowledge upon the evidence of our senses; opinion upon our own reasonings. I do not, in strict propriety of language, believe by my own eyes, any more than I hear by my fingers. I know that this desk is before me; I do not believe it. We know that Mr. Owen is here, but we cannot believe it. I *know* that which is communicated to my sensorium through the avenues of my senses; and all that is thus communicated we denominate knowledge. On the other hand, *belief* has exclusive reference to testimony; and opinion merely expresses different degrees of probability; and after weighing these probabilities we say that we are of this or that or the other *opinion.*"

Thus Mr. Campbell accepts the Lockean scale of certainty and applies this logic in all his reasonings. Like his master, he set *faith* aside as working in the sphere of revelation, and gave it the highest credence. Thus he held to the strict duality of knowledge,—reason and revelation (C. B. 4, 589)—and gave the characteristic

4. Definition of Faith. Faith is the belief of testimony (Chr. Bap'm 64). It differs only from ordinary belief in that it is directed toward a revelation of God. Thus he held that the efficacy of faith rested in the truth believed (Ibid 69); that its strength depended upon the clearness and force of the testimony. He repudiated all subjective distinctions:

> "Some superficial thinkers have spoken and written much upon different kinds of faith. They have 'historical' and 'saving' faith, the 'faith of miracles,' and the 'faith of devils.' etc. These are conceits of the old metaphysical theologians and have done a world of mischief. By placing historical and saving or divine faith in contrast, they have bewildered themselves and their followers. There is no faith worth anything that is not historical; for all our religion is founded upon history."

Hence Mr. Campbell and his followers spent little time in exhorting men to pray for faith. They sought to present the Gospel, give the divine testimony, and believed that faith must come as a necessity if this course is pursued. Just as the sensible object compels recognition if we

open our eyes upon it, evidence compels faith, which is voluntary only in so far as we are able to turn away from the truth. All this is a consistent application of the Empirical Philosophy. For it Mr. Campbell was often reproached that he considered faith as merely an intellectual process. This was true only in that he gave to faith the primacy. The relation to faith of the so-called moral or emotional factor, with its setting, is portrayed in a splendid passage (Chr. Bap'm 293):

"So true it is that all our ideas of the sensible universe are the result of sensation and reflection. All the knowledge we have of material nature has been acquired by the exercise of our senses and of our reason upon those discoveries. With regard to the supernatural knowledge, or the knowledge of God, that comes wholly 'by *faith,*' and 'faith' itself 'comes by hearing.' This aphorism is divine. Faith is, therefore, a consequence of hearing, and hearing is an effect of speaking; for, hearing comes by the Word of God spoken, as much as faith itself comes by hearing. The intellectual and moral arrangement is, therefore: 1. The word spoken; 2. Hearing; 3. Believing; 4. Feeling; 5. Doing. Such is the constitution of the human mind—a constitution divine and excellent, adapted to man's position in the universe. It is never violated in the moral government of God. Religious action is uniformly the effect of religious feeling; that is the effect of faith; that of hearing; and that of something spoken by God."

In no case is mere faith enough. Mr. Campbell simply put the content given to faith by many of his contemporaries into other terms. When exercised upon a person, it becomes warm, almost active (Chr. Sys. 56):

"While then faith is the simple belief of testimony, or of the truth, and never can be more or less than that; as a *principle of action* it has respect to a person or thing interesting to us, and is confidence or trust in that person or thing. Now the belief of what Christ says of himself terminates in trust or confidence in him; and as the Christian religion is a personal thing, both as respects *subject* and *object,* that faith in Christ which is essential to salvation is not the belief of any doctrine, testimony or truth, abstractly, but belief *in* Christ; trust or confidence in him as a person, not a thing."

Mr. Campbell made a summary of faith in the single proposition—"Jesus is the Messiah; the Son of God" (Chr. Bap'm 73). It is interesting to know that this proposition was made the thesis of one of Locke's books, "The Reasonableness of Christianity" (pp. 101, 195). Although the writer has searched carefully through Mr. Campbell's works for references to this book, he has found none. It is probable that Mr.

Campbell did not have it in his library. The agreement is to be accounted for from a common point of view (C. B. 193).

5. Doctrine of Revelation. Mr. Campbell's doctrine of revelation is to be understood from this setting. He says (Owen Deb. 146):

"But I must tell you, while speaking of *revelation,* that perhaps I am misunderstood; and certainly I am, if I am supposed to use this term in the vulgar sense. For now it is usual to call the whole Bible a revelation from God. I must explain myself here. There are a thousand historic facts narrated in the Bible which it would be absurd to regard as immediate and direct *revelation* from the Almighty. Paine defines revelation very accurately, although he did not believe we had any, properly so-called. He says, page 14, "Age of Reason:" "Revelation cannot be applied to anything done upon earth. It is a communication of something which the person to whom the thing is revealed did not know before"—and, I add, could not otherwise know. (That intelligence which could never have been derived to us through the agency of our senses). "Consequently, all the historical and anecdotal part of the Bible is not within the compass and meaning of the word revelation." *Revelation,* from the import of the term, must be supernatural. But the historic parts of both Testaments present a great variety of topographical facts and incidents, colloquies between friends and enemies, of apostles, prophets and patriarchs, and of distinguished persons, good and evil; wars, intrigues, amours and crimes of every dye. Now it would be neither philosophical nor rational to dignify and designate these colloquies, narratives, geographical and biographical notices, etc., by the term *revelation.* The term revelation, in its strict acceptation among intelligent Christians, means nothing more nor less than a Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things, a knowledge of which man could never have attained by the exercise of his reason upon material and sensible objects; for as Paul says, 'Things which the eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man to conceive, has God revealed to us apostles, and we declare them to you.'"

"In the Old Testament, to distinguish the ordinary information from the Divine communications, such intimations are made as *'The word of the Lord,'* or *'A message from the Lord came'* to such a person. Sometimes, *'The Lord said.'* But in the New Testament, the phrase *'The Word'* or *'The word of the Lord'* or *'The Truth'* is almost exclusively appropriated to *the testimony which God gave concerning the person and mission of Jesus Christ."*

(See also C. B. 344-5; Chr. Bap'm 51-4).

This was thoroughgoing Empiricism. To save himself from reproach, Mr. Campbell was very careful to add (Chr. Bap'm 51-2):

"But besides this inspiration of original and supernatural ideas, there was another species of supernatural aid afforded the saints who wrote the historical parts of the sacred scriptures. There was a revival in their minds of what they themselves had seen and heard; and in reference to traditions handed down, such a superintendency of the Spirit of wisdom and knowledge as excluded the possibility of mistake in the matters of fact which they recorded. The promise "of leading into all truth," and the promise of "bringing all things before known to remembrance" by the Holy Spirit, include all that we understand by inspiration in its primary and secondary import." (So. C. B. 345).

This was in reality the distinction between revelation and inspiration (See p. 27). Mr. Campbell meant to state his doctrine so as to free it from many of the objections of skeptics (Owen Deb. 147; C. B. 344), and did not intend to remit the orthodox dogma. In thus placing Revelation in a class by itself, Mr. Campbell held firmly to the Lockean doctrine of its relation to Reason, which must decide whether it be a revelation and whether we interpret it aright or not. He lays down his rules for the proper conduct of the two methods of knowledge (C. B. 380):—

"1. The pretensions of the Bible to a divine authority or origin are to be examined by our reason alone. Its evidences are addressed to our reason, and by our reasoning powers the question is to be answered, "Is the Bible of Divine or human origin?" So soon as reason has decided this question, then,

"2. The truths of the Bible are to be received as first principles, not to be tried by our reason, one by one, but to be received as new principles, from which we are to reason as from intuitive principles in any human science.

"3. The terms found in the Bible are to be interpreted and understood in the common acceptation, as reason or use suggests their meaning; but the things taught are to be received, not because we have proved them by our reason to be truths, but because God has taught them to us."

As a thoroughgoing Empiricist, Mr. Campbell repudiated the whole of natural theology as taught in the colleges of his time (C. B. 275). He considered this to be pure Deism. He was more consistent with his point of view than Locke himself, whom he criticised for his rational proofs of the existence of God (C. B. 373-5). He held that this, with

all the other truths of religion, depends wholly on revelation. This brings us to the next doctrine,

6. Work of the Holy Spirit. Early in the "Christian Baptist" Mr. Campbell wrote an article entitled, "Experimental Religion" (C. B. 48-9). It was written in answer to a charge of impiety because he had criticised the popular revival methods of the time (C. B. 39, 48). This article was destined to be a source of offence to his Baptist brethren, greater even than the Sermon on the Law. It was published in the absence of his father, who rebuked him on his return for putting out his views before his readers were ready for them (Life of J. Smith, 165), and for making matters worse (C. B. 65). Thomas Campbell himself wrote a reply, for the purpose of alleviating the difficulty (C. B. 65-6).

In the article Mr. Campbell showed his unusually astute method He says (C. B. 48):—

"The charge now before us is that we deny 'experimental religion.' Before we plead 'guilty' or 'not guilty' of this impeachment, we should endeavor to understand the subject matter of it. Not having been in the use of the phrase 'experimental religion,' I could neither affirm nor deny anything about it. The question, then, is, what is the thing? The name we have not in our vocabulary; and, therefore, could only deny the thing constructively. We will first ask, what does the Bible say about it? Upon examination, I found it says not one word about 'experimental religion.' The Bible is as silent upon this topic as upon the 'Romish mass.' I then appealed to the 'Encyclopædia.' The only thing like it, which I could find, was 'experimental philosophy,' which is a philosophy that can be proved by experiment. I then looked into the theological dictionaries, and soon found different kinds of religion, such as 'natural,' 'revealed,' etc., but not a word about 'experimental.' I then applied to a friend, who had once been deeply initiated into the modern sublimities of the refined popular doctrine. I was then informed that there were two kinds of religion much talked of in the pulpit and amongst the people—the one called 'heart religion' and the other 'head religion'—the latter dwelling exclusively in the head and the former in the heart. I also learned that the former was sometimes called 'Christian experience,' and this was presumed to be the thing intended by the words 'experimental religion.'"

He then appealed again to the New Testament, but found that it was silent as the grave on all these distinctions. He gave the term "Christian experience" special attention, and found that all Christians have considerable experience; some have more than others, as Paul experienced perils by land and sea, etc. But he was told that this was not the popular sense of the term, but that it meant the "inward experience of grace upon the heart." He then found that the Gospel is sometimes called the "grace of God," and that when believed it yields

the fruits of the Spirit; and declares that if this is what is meant, he never denied a "Christian experience." But again he is informed that this is not the popular use of the phrase, but that it denotes (C. B. 49) "a certain mental experience to becoming a Christian, an exercise of mind, a process through which a person must pass before he can esteem himself a true Christian; and until we know from his recital of it that he has been the subject of it, we cannot esteem him a Christian." and concludes (ibid 49): "Then it is some invisible, indescribable energy exerted upon the minds of men in order to make them Christians; and that, too, independent of, or prior to, the word believed."

This he finds to be contrary to Biblical usage. He ridicules the descriptive preaching of the times by which men were accustomed to narrate their own conversions, instead of declaring the Gospel of the Son of God. He pronounces this system to be mischievous. Enthusiasm flourishes. People lay themselves out for visions and operations, and of course get them (C. B. 218). He calls away from it (C. B. 50):—

"From all this scene of raging enthusiasm, be admonished, my friends, to open your Bibles and to hearken to the voice of God, which is the voice of reason. God now speaks to us only by his Word. By His Son, in the New Testament, he has fully revealed Himself and His Will. This is the only revelation of his Spirit which we are to regard."

Mr. Campbell thus showed an unexpected hostility to the whole Eighteenth Century conception of conversion and to the whole American system of revivals from Jonathan Edwards down (C. B. 404; Harb 35, 355; Harb. 30, 454, 568). This antipathy could not do anything else than bring him into conflict. It was made accordingly the shibboleth of the war on him by his Baptist brethren (C. B. 267; Harb. 30, 133-4; Harb. 31, 78, 81). But Mr. Campbell felt the issue to be worth while, and that he could not restore the primitive faith until certain misconceptions were cleared away. He was sure he knew what he was talking about. He says (C. B. 219):—

"I well remember what pains and conflicts I endured under a fearful apprehension that my convictions and my sorrows for sin were not deep enough. I even envied Newton of his long agony. I even envied Bunyan of his despair. I could have wished, and did wish, that the Spirit of God would bring me down to the very verge of suffering the pains of the damned, that I might be raised to share the joys of the genuine converts. I feared that I had not sufficiently found the depravity of my heart, and had not yet proved that I was utterly without strength. Sometimes I thought that I felt as sensibly, as the ground under my feet, that I had gone just as far as human nature

could go without supernatural aid, and that one step more would place me safe among the regenerated of the Lord; and yet Heaven refused its aid. This, too, I concealed from all the living. I found no comfort in all the declarations of the Gospel, because I wanted one thing to enable me to appropriate them to myself. Lacking this, I could only envy the happy favorites of heaven who enjoyed it, and all my refuge was in a faint hope that I one day might receive that aid which would place my feet upon the rock."

He felt that the true seeking after God must be less introspective and more prospective; that it must look to Jesus Christ through the testimony about him.

Mr. Campbell's task was like that of Locke in his polemic against innate ideas. He said: "There are no such things as subjective and mystic influences of the Holy Spirit;" to put it in a modern term, "Your visions, frames and feelings are mere 'psychological illusions'." "In conversion and sanctification the Holy Spirit operates only through the Word of Truth" (Chr. Bap'm 291). This was merely a consistent application of the Empirical Philosophy. It is all anticipated in the next to the final chapter of Locke's Essay, viz: "Of Enthusiasm" (Book IV. Chap. 19). Mr. Campbell gave for it his usual argument from the constitution of the human mind (Chr. Bap'm 291). Accordingly, Mr. Campbell followed his attack on "mystic influences" (C. B. 64) with a constructive treatise on the Work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men (C. B. 82, 89, 95, 101, 108, 117, 124, 131, 137). In this splendid series of articles he left aside the metaphysical question of the nature of the Holy Spirit, and confined himself wholly to its operations in the process of the world's redemption. This operation he considered to be threefold: (1) As Spirit of Wisdom, by which the Apostles were qualified to deliver a correct, intelligible and consistent testimony of divine truth; (2) As Spirit of Power, by which this testimony was confirmed by miracles and prophecy (C. B. 111); (3) As Spirit of Grace, or Goodness, which (when the gospel of the Grace of God is received) works in the hearts of them that believe and teaches them to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present evil world, and to continue in the grace of God while they abound in the fruits of the Spirit (C. B. 139). Thus the Word and the Spirit always act inseparably. No new faculties are given in the process of salvation, but only new objects are presented to the faculties already existing, which "captivate the affections and passions of the human soul; and, consequently, direct or draw the whole man into new aims, pursuits and endeavors" (C. B. 131). (So Chr. Bap'm 291).

This interesting doctrine may appear to many to be one-sided. It has, without doubt, been carried to an extreme by some of Mr. Campbell's followers, especially those who came in from previous Deistic or Rationalistic convictions (Rich. Mem. II, 355-6). It has been the chief work of Thomas Campbell, Robert Richardson and J. H. Garrison to combat this tendency among the Disciples of Christ. In judging it, we must always remember its antithesis and historical purpose. This is stated in one of those splendid reviews of his career by Mr. Campbell himself (Harb. 37, 198):—

"We much regret the necessity that constrained us to hazard so much on a point so vital, but the case was this: We saw two great errors, as we supposed, existing in society on this subject. We still regard them as desolating evils. The idea of physical or special interpositions of God's Holy Spirit, in the way of dreams, visions, voices and immediate impulses, issuing in swoonings, faintings, jerkings, shoutings, trances, etc., etc.; in all the enthusiasm, if not fanaticism, of camp-meetings; in all the ecstacies of ancient Quakerism or modern shaking and quaking Quakerism, in whatever party it was found, we could not but oppose and repudiate by all the means in our power. Another extreme in metaphysical theology, though less boisterous, noisy and contagious, though equally pernicious to the subject, was that a sinner is so dead and buried in his sin that, even after he has heard the voice of God, speaking by Apostles and Prophets, he must wait still for the Spirit to descend and work faith in his heart by a supernatural process before he attempt even to call upon the name of the Lord. Hence, the essays, sermons and controversies upon the metaphysical regeneration of an unbeliever in order to faith.

"We have opposed these theories because they are not found in the scriptures, and because we have seen and known them to be most injurious to multitudes. But as for doubting or denying either the personality of God's Holy Spirit, or his convicting the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, by the instrumentality of the testimony concerning Christ, or his dwelling in the hearts of the faithful as a comforter, we have given the world no evidence—unless the opposing of the abuses of any doctrine is to be identified with opposing the doctrine itself."

Thus the influences of the Lockean philosophy on the Current Reformation are evident:—

I. It gave to Mr. Campbell and his friends a point of view and method of interpretation which were their chief means of success. This was the philosophy of common-sense. On its principles all scientific

work had been done since the time of Newton. It had percolated down to the lowest strata of the British and American mind. Mr. Campbell came to the common man with a message which was intelligible to him. It had none of the abstractness and mystery of the speculative systems. Locke, Campbell and the average man, alike, hated metaphysics. In the call to a few simple propositions, in taking Christianity on its historic evidences, in reducing Christian duty to specific and definite actions, within and without, all had a common understanding, and felt great satisfaction in what they held to be a superior knowledge. Armed with his Bible and the Essay on the Human Understanding, the frontier evangelist feared no antagonist. Thus they made Christian experience to be rather an intellectual than an emotional process. Faith is the belief of a proposition. It is the acceptance of testimony. It can never stand alone, but the *ordo salutis* is facts, testimony, faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The intellectual element has the primacy. Herein lies the danger of rationalism, which has often preyed upon the thinking of representative members of the Disciples. We must remember that Locke, too, was the father of English Deism; that there are dangers in too closely binding reason and religion, even by the link of revelation. Let us take the suggestion of Kant, Locke's successor, that the mind is active in knowing; that there is a moral element in faith; that "if any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine;" and thereby be sure that we avoid every reproach of bald intellectualism and mere externalism.

II. Here lies patent also the conflict between Mr. Campbell and his theological predecessors. His thinking was based on modern philosophy; their fundamental propositions were from mediæval systems, especially the Liberum Arbitrium of Duns Scotus, through Calvin. He held that God was willing; that no time or effort should be given to induce him to give faith; that we need only use the means already given, open our minds and receive the truth and grace at hand. There was an unmistakable clashing of methods. There is no man living to-day but must admit that Mr. Campbell had the better of the two points of view. We all rejoice in the triumphs of science and philosophy in the Nineteenth Century, by which the mysticism of the old Calvinism, and Arminianism as well, has gone in every quarter, and that we are left free to a simpler and more historical understanding of the ineffable truths of our sacred religion.

CHAPTER IV.

The Precursors.

The background of the Current Reformation is to be found in the history of the Church in Scotland. On Scottish soil the earliest churches appeared, and from Scotch parentage and training the Campbells came. The movement found its prototypes in the Scottish Sects which went before it. Let us trace in brief the rise of these sects, and determine the nature and extent of their contribution to the Current Reformation.

The Reformation.

The Reformation in Scotland was not indigenous to the soil, but was imported from the Continent. Thus it came late, and showed at the beginning the marks of a thoroughly developed Protestantism. Due to the friendly relations of the Scotch people with the French and their common hostility to the English, it was natural that it should come in from the Reformation in France. Accordingly, Patrick Hamilton, a student in the University of Paris, accepted the doctrines of Luther, and, returning home, was martyred in 1528. He was followed by George Wishart (1546); in whose retinue John Knox, an ex-priest, first appears. Emboldened by the example of his friend, he taught openly the Reformed doctrines; until, captured in the Siege of St. Andrews (1547), he was carried off to France, where he served as a galley slave. Having been released, he went to England, where he labored in the Protestant cause under Edward VI. At the accession of Bloody Mary, he fled to the Continent, where he spent some time in study under Calvin and Beza at Geneva. At the accession of Elizabeth, he returned to Scotland and set about the work of reformation in earnest. His supporters met at Edinburgh (1557) and took the old feudal oath of man-rent "to maintain, set forward and establish the most blessed Word of God and His congregation." This was the first of the *Covenants,* from which the reforming party were called the "Congregation" and "Covenanters." The movement was really a rebellion against the regime of the Queen-regent, and had gathered such strength by the time of the arrival of Mary Stuart from France that she was compelled to make concessions to it. Under the dominance of Knox, the Scottish Parliament voted to abolish Popery (1560). Knox

and his associates prepared a Confession of Faith, which was established as the religion of the realm; and the Congregation entered into the place of the Romish system as the State Church. Thus the Scottish Reformation was carried out on the most radical lines of Protestantism. It stood for purity in worship and morals. It was marked by the most bitter iconoclasm of all relics of the Roman order. Calvin's ideas were carried out explicitly. A thoroughgoing Presbyterianism became dominant. Thus the creed and the polity existed before the church, and the key is given to the understanding of all later movements.

The Established Church.

But this church was compelled to undergo one more crisis before it was finally confirmed to its birthright. The Stuarts, James and Charles, were not friendly to the Presbyterian order, but were compelled to yield for a time. Finally, Charles I and Archbishop Laud insanely undertook to force the English Liturgy upon the Scotch people. This was bitterly resented. All eyes were turned to the Cathedral of St. Giles, where the test of the King's mandate was to be made. While the Dean of Edinburgh was going through the service there, before a vast concourse of people, a poor old woman threw her stool at his head, crying "Villain! Dost thou say Mass at my lug?" A riot ensued as the unpremeditated outburst of popular indignation. On February 28, 1638, a great meeting of the nation was called. The Covenant was brought forth. This time the uprising was directed against Prelacy, which was considered as Popery in a new form. Over sixty thousand people signed the parchment. Many opened their veins and signed with blood. Some added the words "till death." Copies were made and carried throughout the kingdom. A new period of iconoclasm broke out. Mass-meetings were held everywhere. The Scottish people seemed to stand as one man in revolt against their King. In the Parliamentary War, which followed, the Solemn League and Covenant was proclaimed throughout Great Britain. It became the shibboleth of the Puritans, who were often called "Covenanters." The Scottish commissioners dominated the Westminster Assembly of English divines (1646), and secured the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith. This was accepted by the General Assembly of Scotland as the successor of the old creed of Knox. It was the creed of the United Kingdom until the Restoration (1660). At the religious settlement after the Revolution of 1688, under William of Orange, it was confirmed as the creed of the Established Church of Scotland. This elaborate document taught a fairly consistent Calvinism. It was upheld by a rigid Presbyterian order

of discipline, to which absolute conformity was demanded in faith and practice.

These two make the distinctive traits of the Church of Scotland.

(1) The authority of the creed.

In England great variety of belief and opinion had always been permitted. Calvinists, Arminians, Covenant theologians, stood side by side. The real bond of union has always been the Prayer Book and not the Thirty-nine Articles. In Scotland, however, the Confession of Faith was first in time, central in the propaganda, and always remained as the test of fellowship.

(2) The theocracy—a jure divino Presbyterianism—

This was a union of church and state in which the church became the uppermost factor. The seat of power descended from General Assembly, Synod, Presbytery, Session, down to the congregation. It was an oligarchy—a government by old and prominent men, whose authority was upheld by a High Commission, when the General Assembly was not in session.

The Scottish sects in which lies our direct interest were the results of a series of revolts against the tyrannies of this Established Church.

The Scottish Sects.

The first of these sects was the Cameronian Covenanters, who repudiated the religious settlement of William III as a compromise with the State. Led by Rev. John Macmillan, they met in 1712, and renewed the "Covenants," with such additions as expressed the protests of their own time and circumstances. Thus they organized themselves into separate societies. They were the ultra—jure divino—or Reformed Presbyterians; but rapidly declined and had no influence on our history. (Rich. Mem. I, 52, Heatherington, History of Church of Scotland, 355).

The Seceders.

The religious settlement of 1690 had within itself the seeds of new troubles. It was made easy for the prelatic curates of the preceding period to retain their parishes merely by conforming to the Presbyterian order. Weary of the long period of religious dissension, the best spirits of the age were resolved to make every concession to the State necessary for peace and prosperity. The Patronage Act, annulled in the Revolutions (1649, 1690), was restored in 1711. By this act and ancient custom, the lord of the manor, or other patrons who car-

ried the greater part of the maintenance of the parish, had the right to present ministers to vacant churches. Upon this presentation, the congregation had the right to reject or accept. But any congregation rejecting the nominee of its patron had to await a second appointment; while often the offending parish was left vacant for years, and the fees withheld to the profit of the patron. By use of this power in the seating of their favorites in the chief places of influence, the secular aristocracy was gradually obtaining control of the Established Church. Such a danger was sure to be scented in the church of Knox and Melville. Two parties began to form,—the Moderates and the Evangelicals. The former winked at the popular tendency, magnified scholarship and preached the ethical side of Christianity. The latter magnified faith and regeneration. The lines were drawn in the Marrow Controversy (see p. 43); which, while it subsided, left Ebenezer Erskine marked as the champion of the Evangelical party. He now took up the rights of the common people in the patronage contests. In 1732 he preached a sermon against the General Assembly, under control of the Moderates. As a true Scotchman, his language was not equivocal. Called before the Assembly, he was voted a rebuke for his conduct. Erskine protested in the name of his rights as a minister and of the constitutional liberties of the Church of Scotland. Three other ministers joined in the protest. They were suspended from their charges. But, being backed by their parishes, they continued to preach regardless of the action of the Assembly, and formed themselves into the Associate Presbytery, 1733; and issued their "Testimony" setting forth their loyalty to the Covenants of the Church of Scotland, and stating the grounds of their secession. When too late, the Church saw its mistake and rescinded its harsh measures; but the schism had gone too far, and Erskine and his friends would not return to the fold. Other prominent ministers joined their ranks. The masses were deeply in sympathy with the Seceders, whom they regarded as martyrs for the truth. The division shook the church from center to circumference. All Anti-Presbyterian elements were led out during the shock. The new movement was democratic in tendency. It sought to maintain the doctrine and polity of the early Reformed Church, which its leaders felt to be slipping away. The Seceders became the tenacious adherents of the Westminster Confession. A second secession occurred in 1761, led by Thomas Gillespie and Thomas Boston (son of the theologian), who formed themselves into the Presbytery of Relief.

The Associate Presbytery grew rapidly until dissension arose over the burgess oath, which led to a schism in 1747. Every magistrate in

Scotland was required to obligate himself to support "the true religion presently professed within this realm." The strict interpreters held that this meant the Established Church, against which they were in rebellion, and hence they could not take the oath. Others said that it meant simply evangelical Christianity, and that they were at liberty to do as they pleased in the matter. Hence, two sects were formed, called the Anti-Burghers and Burghers. A like question arose in 1795,—"the power of civil magistrates in religion." In some places, each sect broke into "Old Lights" and "New Lights,"—as they were called. Other schisms occurred also. This history is of special interest to us, as showing the divisive tendency of the Scotch Sects. It furnished the antithesis to the Current Reformation

Thomas Campbell was a Seceder minister of the north of Ireland, and attained to the principle of "Christian Union" out of bitter experiences in trying to heal the divisions of the church of his choice. Alexander Campbell was brought up in this atmosphere, and may have received its good; as his father had revolted against its evil, viz: the hostility to an established church,—whether Presbyterian, Anglican or Roman Catholic. He was reared a reactionist against human authority in religion. His history shows a deepening of these convictions.

The Scotch Independents

The Scotch Independents represent three different parties. All follow more or less the example of the English Independents, but are historically distinct from them.

(1) The *Old Independents* originated with John Glas, minister of the Church of Scotland at Tealing, who became dissatisfied with the "Union of Church and State," and preached against the Covenants. In 1727 he published his chief work,—"Testimony of the King of Martyrs." He distinguished between the Old and New Testaments, in the former of which he held the state and the church to be identical; but in the latter, the church is a purely spiritual community. Any connection with a kingdom of the world he declared to be unapostolic and sinful (C. B. 229). For his Independent views, he was deposed by the General Assembly, and formed the first "Glassite" congregation at Dundee (1728). The aim of this body was "to restore the primitive New Testament practices." They interpreted the Scriptures literally, and differed from others in the observance of the weekly "Lord's Supper," love-feasts, kiss of charity, feet-washing, the fellowship (a weekly collection for the poor), mutual exhortations, plurality of elders, community of goods (under limitations), public amusements, etc. They were strict disciplinarians, and separated themselves from all who did

not observe a simple worship like themselves. Unanimity was required in every action of the congregation.

The work of Glas was taken up by Robert Sandeman (his son-in-law), after whom the sect was called, outside of Scotland, Sandemanians. Sandeman gave the movement its theological content. He was a stiff upholder of Justification by Faith. He limited faith largely to its intellectual element,—"the bare belief of the bare truth" concerning the person and work of Christ. It is the same as the belief of any proposition.

These old Independents were narrow and divisive; acrimonious in their criticism of others; never became a large body, and were the victims of bitter reproach from all quarters.

(2) The Scotch Baptists

originated in Edinburgh in 1767, when a small body withdrew from the Established Church under the leadership of Archibald McLean. They had no connection with the English Baptists. They grew to some one hundred churches in half a century, and spread into England and Ireland. They adopted the practices of Glas,—weekly communion, mutual exhortation, plurality of elders, etc., —from whom they differed mainly in the practice of immersion (Harb. 35, 297). They are best known through William Jones, of London, author of the History of the Waldenses, who took up Mr. Campbell's writings and published them for a time in the British Millennial Harbinger (Harb. 35, 295).

(3) The New Independents

were an outgrowth of the evangelical revivals represented in England by Wesley and Whitefield, and of the missionary movement headed by Carey and Fuller. They found leadership in Robert and James A. Haldane, two wealthy seamen of noble birth, who, being deeply impressed by religion, abandoned their calling and undertook various philanthropic enterprises. First, Robert Haldane fitted out a missionary expedition to India, taking Greville Ewing with him; but, due to the refusal of admission by the East India Company, the project was given up (1795). Meanwhile, James A. Haldane, impressed by the objection of the opponents of missions that there were plenty of heathen at home, set out on a tour of Scotland with a Mr. Simeon, in which they distributed tracts, organized Sunday-schools and preached in the open air. The preachers were heard with great interest by the masses, and were free in their attacks upon the apparent indifference of the churches to the needs of the people. Robert Hal-

dane built a number of tabernacles in leading cities, where the Gospel could be given to those who desired it. Rowland Hill, the English divine, was invited to the Circus at Edinburgh; but his manner offended many staid Presbyterians. The General Assembly now isued a Circular Letter, in which lay preaching was condemned and the Established Churches were closed to those of other communions. The Seceders did likewise. Robert Haldane retorted by organizing the Society for Propagating the Gospel, and established a series of seminaries, in which young men were educated for the ministry at his expense. These societies, like those of Wesley, were not intended to detract from the Established Church, with which the Haldanes remained in good fellowship. But antagonisms necessarily increased, so that the Circus congregation became an Independent church. James A. Haldane was ordained as pastor, and similar organizations were made in other cities. The movement had been practical and evangelistic. It aimed merely to preach the Gospel, without regard to forms of external arrangement or church order. But now questions of polity were unavoidable, and Greville Ewing, influenced by Glas and McLean, led the way to a Congregational order. Their aim was to approximate the ideal model of primitive Christianity. Accordingly, the Lord's Supper, observed only twice a year in the Established Church, was introduced as a weekly institution. A mid-week meeting was held, at which the members exhorted one another. This custom was extended to the Lord's Day, from which dissension began to arise. A plurality of elders was held to be imperative, and Robert Haldane took his place beside his brother. The final conflict came when James A. Haldane announced to his congregation that he could no longer conscientiously administer infant baptism, and in 1805 was immersed. He stated at the time that he did not intend to join the Baptists, and that in the church the practice should be a matter of forbearance; and that Baptists and Paedo-Baptists might have fellowship with one another. But the antagonism of the Christian world on the subject was too bitter to allow the Haldanean community to escape rupture. A division occurred. Two hundred members followed the example of their pastors. Others left the church, some going to that of Mr. Aikman in the city, some back to the Established Church. The division spread throughout all the tabernacle congregations. Greville Ewing became the leader of the Paedo-baptist faction. From this time, the influence of these New Independents or Haldaneans began to wane, and they were for the most part gradually absorbed into other parties.

The influence of these Scotch Independents on the Current Reformation is patent to every observer.

They furnished excitement and agitation to the stolid life of Scottish religion, in the very period in which Thomas Campbell was attempting to work in Ireland and Alexander Campbell was brought up. They were the subjects of discussion, pro and con, and must have been known to every intelligent reader of the times (Harb. 35, 305). They had an Independent congregation at Rich Hill, which Thomas Campbell and his son were in the habit of visiting (Rich. Mem. I, 60). They touched the Campbells personally through two of their most attractive characters, viz: John Walker (Rich. Mem. I, 60-1, 172; Harb. 35, 299), and Greville Ewing (Rich. Mem. I, 175-7). They gave the model of the society according to which Thomas Campbell first organized his friends in the Christian Association; and later, of the form of church government adopted by Alexander (Rich. Mem. I, 466). They originated the principle of the Restoration of Primitive Christianity (Harb. 35, 302), which they carried out with a crass literalism, and set the points for the application of the same for all who followed.

The agreement of Mr. Campbell's "Ancient Order of Things" with the tenets and practices of these Independents was so marked that the charge of identity was often laid at his door. For instance, R. B. Semple, leader of the Baptists in Virginia, wrote to Mr. Campbell in 1825: "So far as I can judge by your writings and preaching, you are substantially a Sandemanian or Haldanean" (C. B. 227; so C. B. 398, 432). To this Mr. Campbell replied directly in a splendid discussion of the whole question (C. B. 228-9). He affirms an acquaintance with the work and writings of Glas, Sandeman, McLean, the Haldanes (Rich. Mem. I, 422-5); and while he acknowledges a debt to them, he asserts the same of Luther, Calvin and Wesley, and says: "I candidly and unequivocally avow that I do not believe that any one of them had clear and consistent views of the Christian religion *as a whole.*" (C. B. 229). That debt was mainly a negative one. He says: "I am indebted upon the whole as much to their errors as to their virtues; for these have been to me as beacons to the mariner, who might otherwise have run upon the rocks and shoals." He denies interest in these men at the constructive period of life: "For the last ten years I have not looked into the works of any of these men, and have lost the taste I once had for controversial reading of this sort." He then states his real sources: "And during this period my inquiries into the Christian religion have been almost exclusively confined to the

Holy Scriptures." (C. B. 229). On this basis, he claims complete independence (C. B. 229, 399, 445, 614-5). A like charge was made by William Jones (1835), the leading Scotch Baptist of his time, who reproaches Mr. Campbell with ingratitude toward A. McLean, the founder of that sect. (Harb. 35, 295-302). Mr. Campbell again replied with a very interesting dissertation on the factors of his education (Harb. 35, 302-7). He assigned the initiative of the movement to John Glas, 1728. He owns the whole as an historical influence of his Scotch heritage, but maintains again his independence on the basis of the "Bible alone." (Harb. 35, 305). Taking this stand, he did not hesitate to criticise the Scotch Independents freely (C. B. 450), for carrying the principle of Apostolic precedent too far. He thus rejected feet-washing, the holy kiss, a set order of service, etc. At the same time he felt a closer affinity to the Scotch Baptists and Haldaneans than with other parties. He thanks them for the gift of Walter Scott to his cause (Harb. 35, 298). He was always willing to recognize them as brethren, where the relation was reciprocated. The likeness of views and practices was due to similarity of experiences in an independent use of the Scriptures. The relation came too early to affect greatly his final thinking. Its effects were negative. The Scotch Independents aided him in breaking from the religion of his youth (Rich. Mem. I, 189). As he says: "My faith in creeds and confessions of human device was considerably shaken while in Scotland; and I commenced my career in this country under the conviction that nothing that was not as old as the New Testament should be an article of faith, a rule of practice or a term of communion among Christians." We have no reason to deny a practically new product on the free soil of America.

CHAPTER V.

The Rise.

I.

The leaders of the movements in our preceding chapters were the "reformers before the reformation," as Ulmann calls the predecessors of Luther. They gave spring and impulse, warning and admonition, model and example to the pioneers of the Current Reformation. But the latter were trying to break a way not fully tried before them; to clear a ground, spacious and broad, for the exercise of liberty and standing-room for all.

The "Current Reformation" was a providential movement. It came in a time of great religious depression. Many serious hearts were greatly troubled at the apparent outcome of Protestantism,—an indefinite number of warring sects. They had burdensome doubts as to the real progress of the Kingdom of God. The movement arose first with individual men, then with independent churches. They were found scattered over Scotland, England, Ireland, America and Australia. They became grouped, not from any unity of origin, but by similarity of aim. It is in the final cause alone they find the traits of a common species. They came out from all the various religious establishments of the time, and some were without previous church connection. They groped their way, for the most part, independently of each other, toward what they felt to be the light. But they had one thing in common,—the genius of a common Protestantism. They sought to get back of the variant and contradictory forms of Christianity to the eternal Word of God behind all. They opened their Bibles anew, to find there "the way, the truth and the life," apart from the dominant ecclesiastical and doctrinal systems. They saw in these the dogmas and traditions of men. They sought to do for the current Protestantism what Luther had done for the Catholicism of his time. They claimed to be the ultimate and logical Protestantism,—to leave the farthest behind the remains of the Roman Church. They were rightly called the "Reformers," and their work was the "Current Reformation."

Thus diverse in origin, they admitted the largest liberty of opinion, but show a remarkable unity of faith. Let us hear these original leaders speak for themselves.

The English Brethren.

In the Christian Baptist, a monthly magazine published by Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Va., 1823-30, are found a series of letters setting forth the faith and order of several churches widely separated from one another. These sketches were collected in response to a circular letter sent out by a church in New York in 1818, and were later published in a volume (C. B. 389). The occasion of their insertion in the Christian Baptist is a point of interest. In the first volume of his magazine Mr. Campbell had made many severe criticisms of the popular churches of his time. In the second, he felt called upon to do a more constructive work, to build up where he had torn down; or, as he puts it, to "pay a little more attention to the primitive state of things" (C. B. 80). He began accordingly his celebrated series of essays on "A Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things" (C. B. 126, 133, 139, etc.). He pays his respects to all previous reformations, but declares this to be the ideal and "all that is necessary to the happiness and usefulness of Christians" (C. B. 128). While this series was yet running, a reader wrote to ascertain the method to be used in the introduction of the "Ancient Order" (C. B. 184). He accused Mr. Campbell of merely theorizing on the subject, and announced himself as ready to begin to reform if a move could be determined with respect to the churches already in existence which would not do more harm than good. Mr. Campbell confessed in reply the difficulty of the undertaking, but thought it not unsurmountable (C. B. 185). Prejudices and opposition may be aroused, indifference and despair may be common; but as it was with the Jews while in captivity, he held that it was the duty of Christians to remove from Babylon and restore a living model of the Lord's House. Mr. Campbell then gave a brief statement of method (C. B. 185), but concluded:—

"As the best solution of these difficulties, we intend to give the history of the progress and proficiency of some congregations who have taken this course, and are now enjoying a participation of the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of Christ."

He appealed to history; he proposed to show how the reform could be done by showing how it had been done.

But Mr. Campbell was delayed in his purpose by the publication of his translation of the New Testament (C. B. 225, 243). Meanwhile, a second reader sent a sketch of a church in Scotland (name and place not given), which was published in the Christian Magazine, Edinburgh, 1819 (C. B. 243). This Mr. Campbell readily accepted as a

sample of his "Ancient Order." Its story, as told by one of its members, runs as follows (C. B. 245) :—

"We have met together as a church for these six years past. The original members were intimately acquainted with one another. Each of us had, for a considerable time, been groaning under the defects of the societies with which we were then connected. We clearly perceived that they bore none of the features of the churches set in order by the apostles; but we sinfully contented ourselves with our condition. Our chief comfort, as to Christian society, arose from assembling together once a week in what is called a fellowship meeting. On one of these occasions a member spoke with some freedom on the distress he felt, arising from the cause above mentioned. This led the way to a free conversation; and we soon found our distress was not that of an individual, but common to us all. We therefore resolved to walk together as a church in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord Jesus, diligently searching the Scriptures to know his will, and fervently praying to be guided by him. From that period we have assembled regularly on the first day of the week. The Lord has been pleased graciously to countenance us. Our beginning was indeed small; we were few and despised, but walking, as I trust, in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, we have been greatly multiplied. We had soon the satisfaction of choosing two of our brethren, with whose qualifications we were entirely satisfied, as our elders. Their labors of love have been much blessed, and one and another has from time to time been added to our number. Our communion commenced in the full conviction that we were yielding obedience to the Lord Jesus. And now we have increasing experience of the truth of our Saviour's declaration, that if any man do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. We have no standard but the will of our Master; and this we find so clearly stated in the Scriptures that, with the teachable spirit of disciples, we are in no danger of misunderstanding it. We know the benefits of Christian fellowship, by coming together into one place on the first day of the week, and regularly observing the ordinances of Christ, we not only get better acquainted, but our interest in each other is greatly promoted. While we follow our own convictions of duty, and are thankful that, in this highly favored country, every man enjoys liberty to worship God according to his own conscience, we, at the same time, cherish a loving spirit towards all who truly fear God; we earnestly desire the universal spread of the Gospel, and use every means in our power for the salvation of perishing sinners around us."

The promised sketches were soon forthcoming. The New York letter leads (C. B. 389) :—

"The Church professing obedience to the faith of Jesus Christ, assembling together in N. York: To the Churches of Christ scattered over the earth:

"*Dearly Beloved*—That you may be better informed concerning those who thus address you, we have deemed it requisite to give the following brief sketch of our public worship—soliciting, at the same time, that wherein you may differ from us in any matter, faithfulness will dispose you to refer us to apostolic practice, plain and intelligible to the capacity of the plain and simple followers of the Lamb—as we have not much of this world's learning, and are disposed to admit that alone as obligatory, which can be clearly adduced from the New Testament, without the aid of sophistry or allusion to the practices of man. And we trust it may be given us from above, to receive with meekness whatever of this nature your love and concern for our welfare may dispose you to communicate.

"The order, which we derive from the law of Christ, is as follows:

"We require that all whom we receive into fellowship should believe in their heart, and confess with their mouth, that Jesus is the Christ; that he died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that upon such confession, and such alone, they should be baptized.

"We hold it to be the duty and privilege of the disciples of Jesus to come together into one place on every first day of the week, rejoicing in the recollections which that day revives—whereon the Lord Jesus destroyed the power both of hell and death, by his resurrection from the dead, and gave sure hope to his people of being raised also.

"When thus assembled, we proceed to attend to all the ordinances which we can discover to be enjoined by the practice of the first churches and the commandments of the Lord and his apostles."

An order of service was then presented. A method of discipline was also set forth. The letter continues (C. B. 390):—

"The questions and disputations that generally prevail among professing Christians have no place among us; their reasonings and speculations occupy no part of our time. The knowledge of the simple truth, declared by the Lord Jesus and his apostles—and the practical godliness arising from that knowledge, are the things whereon we desire to bestow our attention."

and closes (C. B. 390):—

"There are scattered over this continent a few small societies who have conformed in part to the simplicity of the apostolic faith and practice. We also address to such a similar epistle, and should you favor us with your correspondence, we purpose, if the Lord will, to make known the result of this our communication, to all whom we shall have reason to esteem disciples of the Lord Jesus.

"The date of your coming together—the number of members—whether you have elders and deacons—together with any additional information, will be very acceptable to the church that thus addresses you.

(Signed) "WILLIAM OVINGTON,
"HENRY ERRITT, *Elders.*"

This letter was answered by (C. B. 390):—

"The Church of Christ meeting in Morrison's Court, Glasgow, to their brethren the Church of Christ in New York.

"*Dearly Beloved*—Your epistle of March the 1st came duly to us, and our joy and gratitude to the Father of mercies have been excited by this instance of a society of believers in Christ, meeting together among themselves, and separating from the world and from false professors, in order to walk according to the dictates of the kingdom of Zion, directed by his word and spirit in the exhibition of his kingdom. We are glad to observe also your zeal for ancient brotherly intercourse between churches holding the same faith and observing the same practices—an attainment too much neglected in our days."

A similar faith and order was set forth, but with independence in particulars. The letter closes (C. B. 391):—

"Such churches as ours have existed in Scotland, at Edinburgh and Glasgow, from thirty to forty years. Of late (1812) a division took place on the question of small societies, without pastors, having a right to use the Lord's Supper. We took the affirmative of this question. We differ from some other Baptists also in receiving only baptized believers, whilst they plead for admitting all true believers to their fellowship. We differ from others who forbid the brotherly exhortations on the Lord's day in the public meetings of the church. Our members are about one hundred and eighty. Those of our sister church at Paisley about the same. There are besides a number of churches, as at Perth, London, Liverpool, &c., &c., and many societies without pastors, with whom we are in the habit of Christian intercourse."

A second response came from

"The Church of Christ assembling in Leith Walk, Edinburgh, to the Church of Christ in New York" (C. B. 392):—

"*Dear Brethren*—We have been much refreshed, and edified, by the communication with which you have favored us. Convinced that the more general diffusion of the gospel of the kingdom must be accompanied with a greater degree of union among believers, and that that union can only be produced by renouncing our own wisdom, and keeping the ordinances as delivered by the apostles. I Cor. 11:2. We endeavor in all things to observe the instructions contained in the New Testament. We are, however, deeply sensible, from what we observe in others and still more from our own experience, that we are prone to be misled and blinded by prejudice while professing a desire to do the will of God; and, therefore, we are happy to communicate with our brethren, that we may be mutually profitable to each other.

"In compliance with your wish, we shall now proceed to give you a brief sketch of our history as a church, and inform you of the manner in which we conduct our worship. In most respects it agrees with your practice; and where it differs, we shall mention to you the reasons of our conduct.

"It is about twenty years since we were associated together. At that time we observed the Lord's Supper once a month; and although

we had a pastor, we also procured a succession of preachers from a distance, whose discourses were more addressed to those who were without than to the church.

"Our first step towards scriptural order was our beginning to break bread every Lord's day. In examining this subject, we learned that the churches of Christ, to the end of the world, ought in all things to be guided by the apostolic traditions.

"The subject of mutual exhortation and discipline on the Lord's day was next agitated. These had formerly been attended to at our weekly evening meeting, but we became convinced that whatever is enjoined on the churches should be observed on the first day of the week, as this is the only day on which the disciples are *commanded* to assemble, and on which the great body of the church are able to attend. About the same time, the question of baptism came under our consideration; and in consequence of many being baptized, and mutual exhortation and discipline on the Lord's day being introduced, a considerable number left us, who still continue to assemble as an Independent church. This took place about ten years ago, since which time we have observed our present order.

"Our number is about two hundred and fifty. We have three elders and four deacons; we had four elders, but one of them (Brother Thompson) has for many years been desirous of preaching Christ in foreign lands, and has left us with this intention. He was commended to the Lord for the work by prayer, with fasting and laying on of hands. He sailed on the 12th instant from Liverpool for Buenos Ayres, as he considered the southern part of your continent to be more neglected than any other missionary field. We request your constant prayers on his behalf."

A similar letter was received from the Church of Christ at Tubermore, Ireland, organized in 1807 (C. B. 407); another from the Church at Manchester, England, dating back to 1810 (C. B. 414), and another from the Church at Dublin of the same date (C. B. 420).

These letters are only a few of the volume published by the New York Church. Mr. Campbell says in his review of the series (C. B. 442):—

"We have given the history or brief notices of the origin and progress of sundry churches or congregations which, in Europe and America, have attempted to move out of Babylon. To these we might have added many more, but a sufficient variety appears in the number given to afford a fair specimen."

"From the specimens given, several prominent features of characteristic importance appear pretty much alike in all: —

"1st. Although in countries far remote from each other, and without the identifying influences of ecclesiastic jurisdiction, in the form of superintending judicatories, they appear to have agreed in

making the Scriptures the sole and all-sufficient rule of faith and manners—without the assistance of any *creed* or *formula* of human *contrivance.*

"2d. In the next place, they appear to have drawn from the same source the same general views of the genius and design of the institution of a public weekly meeting of Christians on the first day of the week.

"3d. All concur unanimously in the necessity and importance of the principal items of worship constituting the ancient order of things, such as the weekly commemoration of the death of Jesus and the resurrection; the contribution or fellowship for the necessity of saints; public and social prayer and praise, with the exercise of discipline when necessary; and, indeed, all the other public means of edification; such as public reading of the Scriptures, teaching, preaching and exhortation.

"4th. They moreover give the same general representation of their regard for, as well as apprehension of, the nature and design of the true grace of God—and the indispensable need of a moral and pious life."

Thus, while Mr. Campbell did not hesitate to criticize some of these churches for what he considered still to be the remains of Catholicism in their midst (C. B. 442, 449, 457), he confessed himself in substantial communion with them (Harb. '35, 113), and gave the constitution of a church founded among his new converts in Ohio as an example of his own practice (C. B. 458, 456).

We can identify some of these churches. The New York Church is identical with the West Fifty-sixth Street Church of the Disciples to-day, with which the Disciples of Christ have always been in communion. The Glasgow Church was probably of Scotch Baptist origin. It antedates the Haldanes (C. B. 391). It was not the same as the congregation of Greville Ewing, which met on Jamaica street (Rich. Mem. I, 167; Haldane's Mem., 225). In fellowship with this congregation were churches at Paisley, Perth, London, Liverpool (C. B. 391), Manchester, Nottingham, etc. (Harb. '35, 297).

The Edinburgh Church was the congregation of J. A. Haldane, the remains of the Circus congregation which had moved to Leith Walk (A. Haldane Mem., 273-4), which, by the immersion of the majority of its members and consequent withdrawal of the minority, had approached the order of the Scotch Baptist churches, though independent of them (A. Haldane Mem., 325-6). The Tubermore (Ireland) Church was the congregation of Alexander Carson, who had with-

drawn from the Established Church in 1803, because he had become an Independent in his views of church government (C. B. 75). He also became an immersionist, although the subject was one of forbearance in his church membership.

Most of these churches arose independently of each other. They had formed some acquaintance with one another through circular letters, of which the New York letter is a fair sample (C. B. 415). An occasional messenger passed from one to another, and told of the attempts of his brethren at home to live the simple faith of the New Testament. As yet there was no stated ministry, but the care of the churches under an eldership, which supported itself by some daily occupation, tended to further isolation. These churches of Scotland, England and Ireland, which had already begun to feel that they had something in common, sent many members to America (C. B. 414; Harb. '35, 305, 563); who, when they saw the work of the Campbells and their associates, joined heartily in the movement. Walter Scott and John Thomas, of Virginia, were of this number. Through such, the writings of Mr. Campbell were gradually introduced into Great Britain (Harb. '48, 514). These brought forth fruit. In 1835, William Jones, of London, began the publication of the British Millennial Harbinger, a reprint of selected portions of the Christian Baptist and Millennial Harbinger. When he later dissented from Mr. Campbell's views on the Holy Spirit and ceased the publication, it was taken up by the Nottingham brethren under the title of the Christian Messenger, J. Wallis, Editor. Under this guidance, the churches of diverse origins approached more and more a common type. To them Mr. Campbell went on invitation, in company with James Henshal, as the messenger of the American churches of the same faith and order, in 1848. He was received as a brother by congregations in Mollington, Liverpool, Chester, Shrewsbury, Nottingham, London, etc. He declared the "faith once for all delivered to the saints," and his message was gladly received. He continued his tour through Scotland, where he was met by some two or three hundred brethren from near and far (Harb. '48, 219). Here he noted with sorrow the decline of the great church of James A. Haldane (Harb. '48, 220-1). He returned south by way of Ireland, where he visited his old home and was refused admission by the son of Alexander Carson to the historic church of Tubermore (Harb. '48, 515), now in communion with the English Baptists. He hastened on to Chester, Eng., where representatives of all the churches of Great Britain professing the primitive order were gathered, of which a co-operation was formed for the propagation of the cause (Harb. '48,

569-572). These constituted what we sometimes call the "Old English Brethren," and whose work has by no means been adequately recognized.

Thus it is evident that the Current Reformation antedates the Campbells,—not the son only, but the father also. It was a general movement,—the manifestation of a certain phase of Protestantism—the product of the Divine Spirit working on the spirit of the age in the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. It had its rise in the providence of God. Originating independently from distant and diverse soils, its factors found means of communication and progressive union through the publications of Alexander Campbell. But this man, admittedly the greatest spirit of the movement, was only the voice, not the source; a product, not the founder of the Disciples of Christ; a brother in the Lord, and not the father of us all. He brought the principles of the movement to their most classical expression. In so far he became a model for all who followed. The tribute of Barton W. Stone, uttered in 1827, well expressed the intense interest and extreme solicitude of hundreds of independent and older reformers as they looked upon his career (C. B. 378).

"From the Christian Messenger to the Christian Baptist:

"*Brother Campbell*—Your talents and learning we have highly respected; your course we have generally approved; your religious views, in many points, accord with our own; and to one point we have hoped we both were directing our efforts, which point is to unite the flock of Christ, scattered in the dark and cloudy day. We have seen you, with the arm of a Samson, and the courage of a David, tearing away the long established foundations of partyism, human authoritative creeds and confessions; we have seen you successfully attacking many false notions and speculations in religion—and against every substitute for the Bible and its simplicity we have seen you exerting all your mighty powers. Human edifices begin to totter, and their builders to tremble. Every means is tried to prevent their ruin, and to crush the man who dares attempt it. We confess our fears that in some of your well-intended aims at error you have unintentionally wounded the truth. Not as unconcerned spectators have we looked on the mighty war between you and your opposers; a war in which many of us had been engaged for many years before you entered the field. You have made a diversion in our favor, and to you is turned the attention of creed makers and party spirits, and on you is hurled their ghostly thunder. We enjoy a temporary peace and respite from war where you are known."

Mr. Campbell always entered the arena conscious of this cloud of witnesses behind and around him. He was strong to run his race, because he knew he bore the love and goodwill of a great multitude of

the noblest and sincerest souls of his kind. A right understanding of this relation will greatly help the proper appreciation of the Current Reformation.

II.

When we turn to the American wing of the Current Reformation, we come out into the clear light of history. Here, too, the movement came of diverse origins. By the process of mutual recognition and coalition the independent factors became one. Three nuclei of beginnings are easily determined: (1) The group around the New York church; (2) that around the Campbells, of Bethany, Va.; (3) that around Barton W. Stone, of Kentucky. Let us study each of these in turn.

I. The Disciples.

As far as we can gather, the New York Church arose from the immigration of Scotch Baptists to America (Harb. '35, 298). The date of its beginning, as far as we can ascertain, was 1810. It had a full-fledged organization in 1818, and had sufficient self-consciousness to prepare a circular letter setting forth its faith and order and to address it to a series of churches in America and Europe which were felt to be of its kind (C. B. 390). This letter solicited correspondence and a mutual exchange of ideas and aims. It was no accident that this letter reached a certain group of churches, and no others, and was responded to cordially by them. This group had had a common root in the Old World. But in new surroundings, the New York brethren, setting their model in the "apostolic practice," desiring to admit as obligatory only that which can be clearly adduced from the New Testament, sought a faith and order the result of their own researches and set them forth for the friendly criticism of those most akin to them (C. B. 389-90). Admission to membership in this church was conditioned on a confession of faith in Jesus Christ and baptism into His name. They met together on the first day of the week in commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus. They sought therein to attend to all the ordinances for which precedent or precept could be found in the primitive churches. They sat in their assemblies apart from the non-members, and observed the following order of service: (1) Prayer; (2) Praise; (3) The Lord's Supper; (4) The Fellowship—a collection for the saints; (5) Reading of the Scriptures—one passage from the Law, one from the Prophets and one from the New Testament; (6) Exhortation, by one of the elders or brethren; (7) Praise; (8) Prayer and Separation. In the evening, the church also met, when one of the elders declared the Gospel to those without. Thus every part of the

Lord's Day services was held as a matter of strict obligation. But on a week-day evening a "love feast" was attended to, in which the "kiss of charity" and washing of the disciples' feet were observed, but not of the same obligation. The elders labored at their respective callings, and held it an honor not to be burdensome to the church. A strict discipline was maintained. There were no ranks or degrees in their relations as Christians, but all were brethren. Forbearance was taught as a primal virtue. No time was given to speculations and disputations common in those times; but the knowledge of the simple truth declared by Jesus and His apostles, and the practical godliness arising therefrom, was enough for their attention. Unanimity in all decisions of the church, and not a mere majority, was regarded as the scriptural rule. They called the congregation the "Church of Christ," and its members the "Disciples." They already had a flourishing mission at Danbury, Conn. (1817, Life of Isaac Errett I, 26). They were in relation with other small societies in America (C. B. 346), from one of which, viz: that of Pittsburg, came the connection with the Campbells and the future significance of the New York Church to the movement as a whole.

George Forrester, a Haldanean preacher, had gathered a small congregation in Pittsburg, while he supported himself by the conduct of an Academy. Thither came Walter Scott, a recent graduate of Edinburgh University, to see the Western country, 1818. He was engaged as a fellow-teacher. This young man, reared in the Established Church, was much impressed by the novelty of the religious views of his master, to which he soon assented and united with the church. To this church came the pamphlets of the New York Church. These so delighted young Scott that he resigned his position and set out on foot to make a closer acquaintance with the New York brethren, whom he considered as most excellent in their views of the Gospel. But on arrival he was sorely disappointed. One of those unfortunate dissensions had broken out which have so often put to shame the upholders of the "primitive gospel," who ever find it difficult to bring their practice up to their theory.

Henry Errett, the prime mover in the early activities of the church, had withdrawn. Scott returned to Pittsburg, soon to take up the work of Forrester in school and church. In 1820, Scott met Mr. Campbell, and resolved to throw himself heartily into the movement which the latter then represented. A union was soon made between Scott's church and a reformed Baptist church under the pastoral care of Sidney Rigdon (Harb. '48, 553). To this church later came the family of

Henry Errett (Lamar, "Life of Isaac Errett" I, 40). Here Isaac Errett was baptized and began his labors in the cause.

Thus these early Disciples arose independently of the Campbells. They were in reality the offshoots of the English Movement; except that in the new country old party lines were not drawn, and the precursors and representatives of the Current Reformation coalesced into one. Thus their contribution was fourfold:—

(1) They made the connection between a large body of immigrants, who were seeking the Bible way, and the movement headed by the Campbells, through which avenue most important recruits have been gained to the cause in this country (Harb. '35, 298).

(2) They gave the New York and other Eastern churches, from which has come almost the whole strength of the Disciples of Christ in New York, New England and Canada.

(3) They gave the rich personalities of Walter Scott and Isaac Errett, without whom we should feel ourselves poor indeed.

(4) They gave an earlier, a more separatist understanding of the principles of the Reformation; which, coupled with the Scotch traits of character, has made itself felt to this day.

But this branch of the Reformation affiliated at the beginning with the followers of Mr. Campbell, and has shared in the labors and struggles of the movement in all its history.

II. The Reformers.

When we take up the central branch of the Current Reformation in America, we are in a much more favorable position as historians. Here men were before the movement. From a study of the characters of Thomas and Alexander Campbell, we can arrive at the motives of the movement and the principles for which they stood.

Thomas Campbell.

Thomas Campbell comes out into history as a Seceder minister of the North of Ireland. He was of Scotch descent; his wife of French Huguenot. He had been educated in Glasgow University and in the theological school of the Anti-burgher branch of the Seceders to which he belonged. He was settled at Rich Hill, where he conducted an academy, while preaching for the church at Ahorey in the country. But, catholic in spirit, of a large and loving heart and of a very genial and social disposition, he could not confine his sympathies to the narrow party to which he belonged. He felt keenly the sins of sectarianism, and set it as his life work to do something to heal the divisions of Christianity.

His first public act was an effort to unite the Burghers and Anti-Burghers of Ireland (Rich. Mem. I, 57). The burgess oath had never been required on that island; and as the two parties were willing to unite, there seemed to him to be not the slightest reason for continued separation. But word came from the higher court in Scotland, expressing in advance disapprobation of the union. Thomas Campbell was accordingly sent to the General Associate Synod to request an increased independence for the Irish churches. His petition was refused, and he returned home, having lost his first case in an ecclesiastical court, much downcast at the prospect. This bitter experience was soon to be repeated, once and again, on a far different soil. The health of Thomas Campbell having been imperiled by constant toil in school and church, a voyage to America was prescribed as the only remedy. He set out therefor. Pleased with the New World, he ordered his family to follow, and settled at Washington, Western Pennsylvania, under the charge of the Chartiers Presbytery (Rich. Mem. I, '88). But sectarian strife was even more bitter on the American frontier than in the Old Country. Thomas Campbell was not slow to express his disapproval of this state of affairs, and to show his high respect for those of other religious parties. His personal popularity as a preacher did not increase the regard for him among his less accomplished associates. Accordingly, when on a tour north of Pittsburg and finding many Presbyterians, not Seceders, in his congregation, he took occasion to lament the existing divisions and to invite them to sit down with the little Seceder church at the Lord's Table. Thomas Campbell greatly prized this ordinance. His heart went out in sympathy to those Christians many of whom had not had the privilege of communion for years. But the Seceders were close communionists. A Mr. Wilson, who was present at the time, finding that Thomas Campbell had little respect for party differences, brought the charge of failure to maintain a strict adherence to the Seceder Testimony and Discipline before the next meeting of the Chartiers Presbytery. Mr. Campbell, when questioned as to his views, stated that he had always been opposed to religious partyism, and insisted that he had violated no precept of the sacred volume. The Presbytery voted that he be censured. Mr. Campbell appealed to the Synod. This higher court found irregularities in the action of the Presbytery, but let the censure remain. To this decision, Mr. Campbell at first submitted; but finding that the enmity of his fellow-ministers was only intensified by the issue of the trial, he sent a formal renunciation of the authority of the Synod and finally withdrew from the Seceders altogether (Rich. Mem. I, 223-30). The pain at this outcome

of so trivial an offence was beyond description to Thomas Campbell. His disappointment in Ireland was nothing when compared with it. He was sure his motives were the best. It was the loving heart of Thomas Campbell which got him into trouble. Note the part this shall play in the future. The defence before the Synod is an interesting document (Rich. Mem. I, 226-8). It shows the germs of the later "Declaration and Address." When accused of not being true to the Seceder standard, he fell back on the Divine Standard, and refused to be convinced by anything less than a "Thus saith the Lord;" to which standard he promised to make his life conformable. He soon had abundant opportunities for the application of his principle.

To cease to be a Seceder did not mean the end of Thomas Campbell's ministry. His old Irish neighbors and others gathered around him in closer sympathy. He was accustomed to address them in barns and groves and houses, as occasion offered. In the process of these discourses, he bewailed the partisan divisions of the church, set forth the Bible as a sufficient rule for faith and practice and pleaded for Christian Union and co-operation. The meeting appointed from time to time was compelled at last to face the question of a permanent organization. The tie up to this time had largely been the personal one. The group of friends of Thomas Campbell represented all of the prominent sects of the time, and some had never belonged to any church. Upon what basis could they formally unite into a little society; and what should this society be or stand for? A meeting was appointed in the home of Abraham Altars for the consideration of these questions. Thomas Campbell spoke to the subject. He reviewed the history of their little gatherings, defined what he considered the basis of his teachings, urged them to accept the same principles and closed with the words which are his chief claim to fame: "That rule, my highly respected hearers, is this, that *where the Scriptures speak we speak and where the Scriptures are silent we are silent.*" This utterance came like a message from God to the little assembly. All felt they had their motto. The plain, simple statement of the Word of God should be their guide. They would have no other. They would respect the silence of the Bible. If there was no utterance, there should be no doctrine. Thus they hoped to avoid the questions on which the Christian World had divided, and to find a basis for union, communion and a reformation of the existing state of affairs. (Rich. Mem. I, 231-7).

For this purpose a society was formed, called "The Christian Association of Washington." Thomas Campbell found his models for this society in the Wesleyan and Haldanean societies of the Old World.

Thomas Campbell and Thomas Acheson were appointed to draw a statement of the purposes and aims of the association. This was soon published as the "Declaration and Address." In this document of fifty-four pages (Young's Historical Documents) they set forth their purpose as the promoting of simple evangelical Christianity; disavowed the purpose of forming a church or separate religious party at all; they did not intend to observe the ordinances; they were to meet only half-yearly; they were merely the voluntary advocates of a church reformation, viz., the *Union of all Christians*. For this purpose, they proposed to require nothing as "a matter of faith or duty, for which there can not be expressly produced a 'Thus saith the Lord,' either in express terms or by approved precedent."

This was the great contribution of Thomas Campbell,—the emphasis on the Principle of Christian Union. Others had held to it as something to be desired, as a part of the ideal Christian state, but Thomas Campbell made the first strenuous effort to realize the ideal. This desire was the mainspring of all his labors. It was henceforth to remain at the front, at least in theory if not in practice.

But success did not come to the reformatory movement as expected. The Declaration and Address seemed to have fallen on deaf ears. No second Christian Association was formed. While many praised the purpose of the society, few publicly espoused its cause. Its members were more and more breaking away from their previous church connections. It seemed that the Christian Association must become a new party. They began to hear the reproach that instead of promoting union they were adding one more to the number of sects. The dread of this outcome, which was just the opposite of the purpose of Thomas Campbell, seems to have been a ruling motive in this period, and accounts for a course of action which from any other consideration must appear as weak and inconsistent.

Accordingly, when some friends from the regular Presbyterian Church urged him to unite with them, he made formal application to the Synod of Pittsburg (1811), for "Christian and ministerial communion" with that body. He felt his belief to be in substantial agreement with the Westminster Confession of Faith. In this proposed union, Thomas Campbell stated plainly the principles and purposes of the Christian Association, which he had no intention of giving up. He wished to submit himself to the authority of the Synod as a regular Presbyterian minister, while he went on in the work of this non-ecclesiastical organization. The refusal of the Synod was unanimous. When pressed for reasons, it gave the following:

"(a) For expressing his belief that there are some opinions taught in our Confession of Faith which are not founded in the Bible.

"(b) For declaring that the administration of baptism to infants is not authorized by scriptural precept or example.

"(c) For encouraging his son to preach without any regular authority.

"(d) For opposing creeds and confessions as injurious to the interest of religion."

But the chief reason was that "it is not consistent with the regulations of the Presbyterian Church that the Synod should form a connection with any ministers, churches or associations."

This reply was a fair statement of the attitude of the prominent denominations to the Christian Association. Thomas Campbell felt the rebuff most keenly. He and Alexander were at that time not members of any sect; they were cut off from church privileges. It became evident that the Christian Association must either disband or become an independent church. It is quite likely that the former alternative would have been the fate of the little society had not the leadership fallen to the son, Alexander Campbell, now twenty-three years of age, who had not favored the approach to the Presbyterians, and now he did not propose that the aspersions of the Synod should go unanswered. Accordingly, he announced that he would reply to the objections of the Synod at the next meeting of the Christian Association. It was the young man's first effort at polemics. He took up the objections one by one and dealt with them so effectively that all saw that the cause had found a new champion. Under his bolder and more aggressive spirit the path of further progress was marked out.

Alexander Campbell.

The future of the Current Reformation was so bound up with the destiny of this young man that we are justified in tracing it hereafter along with the thread of his personal history. We can do this almost wholly in his own language. The very question which we are considering had often been propounded to Mr. Campbell in the prime of his manhood (Harb. '48, 280). He answered by a series of autobiographical sketches (C. B. 72, 92, 219, 228-9, 238, 664; Harb. '30, 137-8; Harb. '35, 302-4; Harb. '48, 278-83, 344-9, 522-4, 552-7, 613-6; Harb. '49, 46-8), which are both most interesting and the most authentic sources for our information.

Alexander Campbell was born in County Antrim, North Ireland, in 1788. We can pass over his youth and education for our present purposes, except to note a marked trait of his character, viz., inde-

pendence of mind (Rich. Mem. I. 33). This is the key to the contribution of the son, as that crowning trait—a catholic spirit—explains the work of the father.

He considers his own proper career to begin with his departure from Ireland (C. B. 92):

"I sailed from the city of Londonderry on the 3d day of October, 1808, destined for the city of Philadelphia; but being shipwrecked on the coast of the island of Ila on the night of the 9th of the same month. I was detained until the 3d day of August, 1809, on which day I sailed from the city of Greenock for New York. On the 27th of which month I and the whole ship's company had almost perished in the Atlantic; but through the watchful care and tender mercy of our Heavenly Father, we were brought to the harbor which we desired to see, and safely landed in New York on the 29th of September, 1809. On the 28th of the next month I arrived in Washington, Pennsylvania, to which place I have been known ever since."

He had experienced a normal Eighteenth Century conversion (C. B. 219, see p. 67; Harb. '30, 137). He had been an enthusiast of the dominant religion (C. B. 238). His calling in life was set by the domination of the same. He says (C. B. 664):

"Having been educated as Presbyterian clergymen generally are, and looking forward to the ministry as both an honorable and useful calling, all my expectations and prospects in future life were, at the age of twenty-one, identified with the office of the ministry."

But in Scotland he met Greville Ewing; who, in the language of Kant, aroused him from his dogmatic slumbers. As he says (C. B. 92):

"My faith in creeds and confessions of human device was considerably shaken while in Scotland."

But too much must not be made of this experience. As he says in the context (C. B. 92):

"I arrived in this country with credentials in my pocket from that sect of Presbyterians known by the name of *Seceders*. These credentials certified that I had been both in Ireland in the presbytery of Market Hill, and in Scotland in the presbytery of Glasgow a member of the Secession church, in good standing."

Nor should too much be made of the whole Glasgow influence (Rich Mem. I, 190). He was only twenty years of age at the time. We can hardly expect a grasping of the positive principles of his life at this early period.

The shock was little more than that which is prone to come upon any young man, especially in college, in the transition from the religion of youth to that of greater maturity. Certainly the period of crossing

the great ocean was one of discontent and uncertainty. On arrival in America, he was ready with all the vigor and enthusiasm of young manhood to launch into a new movement, especially when presented by so loved and respected a guide as his father (Harb. '48 282). He says accordingly (Harb. '48, 280):

"The first proof-sheet that I ever read was a form of 'My father's Declaration and Address,' in press in Washington, Pa., on my arrival there in October, 1809. There were in it the following sentences: 'Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church, or to be made a term of communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of Divine obligation in the church constitution and management but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles upon the New Testament church, either in express terms or approved precedent.' These last words, 'express terms' and 'approved precedent,' made a deep impression on my mind, then well-furnished with the popular doctrines of the Presbyterian Church in all its branches."

Here may be seen the part played by Alexander Campbell in the Current Reformation. He came in after the principles of the movement had been both determined and stated. These he accepted from his father, who had arrived at them while separated from the son. Alexander's contribution was: (1) The application of the principles of the Declaration and Address to the teachings and practice of members of the Christian Association; and (2) the world-wide proclamation of the same through his writings and debates.

Thus his statement became a means for recognition and union of numerous independent reformers in both hemispheres. As he says (C. B. 92):

"I commenced my career in this country under the conviction that nothing that was not as old as the New Testament should be made an article of faith, a rule of practice, or a term of communion amongst Christians. In a word, that the whole of the Christian religion exhibited in prophecy and type in the Old Testament, was presented in the fullest, clearest, and most perfect manner in the New Testament, by the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. This has been the *pole-star* of my course ever since, and I thank God that he has enabled me so far to prosecute it, and to make all my prejudices and ambition bow to this *emancipating principle.*"

We reach now the second stage of the history of this central branch of the American Movement—from 1810 to 1830—viz., the application of the principles. It happened to be coincident also with the connection with the Baptists. The period opened with the overtures to the

Presbyterians. Mr. Campbell gives the status of their motives and views at the beginning of this process (Harb. '37, 146):—

"So fully were we aware of the evils of schism, and so reluctant to assume the attitude of a new party, that we proposed to continue in the Presbyterian connexion even after we were convinced of various imperfections in the form of its government, in its system of discipline, in its administration of Christian ordinances, and of the want of Scriptural warrant for infant baptism; provided only they would allow us to follow out our convictions by not obliging us to do what we could not approve, and allow us to teach and enforce only those matters for which we could produce clear Scriptural authority and make all the rest a subject of forbearance till farther enlightened."

These questions of difference received attention one by one and came to satisfactory solution. Let us take them up in order:—

(1) Church Government (C. B. 92).

"I continued in the examination of the Scriptures, ecclesiastical history, and systems of divinity, ancient and modern, until July 15, 1810, on which day I publicly avowed my convictions of the *independency* of the church of Christ, and the excellency and authority of the Scriptures, in a discourse from the last section of what is commonly called 'Christ's Sermon on the Mount.'"

(See Rich. Mem. I, 313, 345-9, 466).

(2) Baptism (C. B. 92).

"In conformity to the grand principle which I have called the pole-star of my course of religious inquiry, I was led to question the *claims of infant sprinkling to divine authority,* and was, after a long, serious, and prayerful examination of all means of information, led to *solicit immersion* on a *profession* of my *faith,* when as yet I scarce knew a Baptist from Washington to the Ohio, in the immediate region of my labors, and when I did not know that any friend or relation on earth would concur with me. I was accordingly baptized by Elder Matthias Luse, who was accompanied by Elder Henry Spears, on the 12th day of June, 1812."

(See Harb. '48, 281-3; Rich. Mem. I, 49, 82, 180-1, 186-7, 237-8, 240, 344-5, 392-6).

(3) The Confession—At the baptism Mr. Campbell refused to give a narration of his religious experience, as was the custom among the Baptists, and would receive the rite only on the confession that "Jesus is the Christ." (Harb. '48, 282-3; Rich. Mem. 1, 398-410).

This change of views on the subject of baptism was not an ordinary event in the experiences of Alexander Campbell. It led to a transformation of all his thinking under the guidance of his new principles

(Harb. '48, 344). It marked a crisis also in the history of the Christian Association. Thomas Campbell and the majority of the members followed the example of Alexander. Many others took offence at this action and withdrew. The Christian Association became a body of immersed believers. This brought about a new alignment. At the time of his immersion, Mr. Campbell had an intense prejudice against the Baptists (Harb. '48, 345; C. B. 92). But again their ardent desire to make for Christian Union, and not to start a new religious party, overcame all objections.

Mr. Campbell says (Harb. '37, 146):—

"In the second place, when it became necessary, because of the refusal of our Pædobaptist friends to permit this, and more especially because of our actual renunciation of infant baptism, to be separated from our former religious connections (although we had then a very humble opinion of the 'intelligence' and piety of the Baptist society of Western Pa. and Va.), we were willing to unite with them rather than form a new party, and did accordingly make to them a proposition to that effect."

In this union, it was not the purpose of the members of the Christian Association to give up their principles and purposes, as was explicitly stated in the terms of agreement (Harb. '37, 147)—

"In our overtures to the Baptists we fully and faithfully gave them in writing an explicit statement of the points in which we concurred with them, and of the points in which we differed, asserting our willingness to co-operate with them on the principle of mutual forbearance on all matters of opinion, and of united action in all matters of faith, piety and morality. They covenanted to form such a union, and in good faith of this agreement we entered into it September, 1813. On the Bible, as our only rule of faith, piety and morality, we solemnly covenanted, as the Records of the Redstone Baptist Association will show."

(So C. B. 92; Harb. '48, 346).

Thus the Brush Run Church, as it was now called, did not adopt the Philadelphia Confession of Faith as its creed, after the manner of Baptist churches in that day, but took the Bible as its only standard. A model was thus formed for an order of reformation, which was followed by many of the Baptist churches themselves. At the time of union, a minority of the Redstone Association opposed the action (Harb. '48, 347). This was destined to grow until a schism between the two orders took place. Meanwhile, a period of peace ensued. Mr. Campbell gave himself to pursuits of agriculture, to study and itinerating among the Baptist churches (C. B. 92, 664; Harb. '48, 347). A

meeting house was built at Wellsburg. Buffalo Seminary was started 1818.

In this period, the principles of the movement were applied to the following subjects:—

4. Faith; its nature and place in the Christian system (Rich. Mem. I, 411-28; C. B. 228-9; Harb. '30, 137). See pp. 62, 63.
5. The Lord's Day,—versus the Sabbath (Rich. Mem. I, 433-5).
6. The Work of the Holy Spirit (Harb. '30, 137-8). See p. 66
7. The Progress of Revelation, The Old and New Testaments, the Dispensations (Harb. '48, 348; Rich. Mem. I, 471-9). See p. 48.
8. Nomenclature,—whence the motto "Bible names for Bible things." (Walker Deb. 19).

But the conflict with the Baptists soon came on apace. In this conflict the Reformers, as they now came to be called, were driven violently from the Baptist fold; and Mr. Campbell was to win the reputation of one of the most brilliant controversialists in America. This process was painful enough. There was much misunderstanding and bitterness on both sides. We shall depict it most briefly, and only in so far as the purposes of our study demand. The first battle was over the Sermon on the Law, 1816, (See Young's Historical Documents; Harb. '46, 493-). Jealousy had grown up in the breasts of some of the preachers of the Redstone Association. The erection of the house at Wellsburg was a factor in this, as the Cross Creek Church, three miles in the country, regarded this as an encroachment on their territory. Accordingly, at an association meeting at the latter place, Mr. Campbell was invited to preach only under the pressure of his friends. He gave his familiar distinction between the Law and the Gospel, the Old Dispensation and the New, Moses and Christ (Harb. '48, 348). Opposition was made at once. The sermon was made a pretext for a heresy trial the next year, but the enemy was defeated by a strong majority. Mr. Campbell had it published to avoid misrepresentation. It was his first pamphlet. The event was dramatic in its effect on his future. He says (Harb. '46, 393):—

"This unfortunate sermon involved me in a seven years' war with some members of said Association, and became a matter of much debate. . . . It is therefore highly probable to my mind that but for the persecution begun on the alleged heresy of this sermon whether the present reformation had ever been advocated by me."

Next came the Walker Debate, 1820, which introduced him to the Baptists of Ohio, and made valuable friends in the Mahoning Association, including Adamson Bentley and Sidney Rigdon (Harb. '48, 522-3). From this time, Mr. Campbell went regularly to the yearly meeting of this association, by which means this whole body was brought to practical acceptance of the views of the Reformers.

Meanwhile Thomas Campbell had opened an academy in Pittsburg. He found there Walter Scott, then in charge of the Haldanean church founded by George Forrester. Alexander visited the city often. A lifelong friendship and alliance was formed between the future leaders of the cause. The regular Baptist Church at Pittsburg embraced the Reformation, and Sidney Rigdon was settled as pastor. A union was soon accomplished between the churches of Scott and Rigdon. Thus was formed the third church of the Reformation (Harb. '48, 556). Samuel Church soon united with this congregation and became its minister.

Meanwhile, the second church had been formed by strategem. After the Sermon on the Law, Mr. Campbell ceased to itinerate so extensively and gave himself more to teaching in Buffalo Seminary. The opposition, taking advantage of this, grew rapidly. In 1823 they gathered all their forces and resolved to expel him from the Redstone Association. Mr. Campbell heard of the plot a month in advance; and as he was announced to debate with Mr. McCalla in October, and did not wish to appear as excommunicated by his own religious party, he executed a flank movement on his enemies. Accordingly, in quiet, he had twenty members dismissed from the Brush Run Church; went with them and formed a new church in the meeting house at Wellsburg; sent messengers to the Mahoning Association and was accepted by the same; and when called up by his former Redstone brethren, demurely informed them that he was outside their jurisdiction (Harb. '48, 553-6).

This year 1823 was notable in other respects. Then began the publication of the Christian Baptist, which did so much as a medium of exchange between the diverse seekers after the Ancient Order. Then also occurred the McCalla Debate, which introduced Mr. Campbell to the Baptists of Kentucky. This was followed by a series of tours to this State, by means of which the seeds of the Reformation were sown broadcast. The Christian Baptist did valuable service in this work (Harb. '48, 613-6). Soon after this, Philip S. Fall, late from England, was settled as pastor of the Baptist Church in Louisville. He openly espoused the Reformation, and under his guidance the church replaced its creed with the New Testament. He soon moved to Nashville, and

there repeated the process. Thus were added the fourth and fifth churches.

The order of Reformation now became so rapid that we can not follow it in detail. This was generally accomplished by voting out the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, and by taking the Bible as the sole standard.

In this period, the principles of the movement were applied to the subject of the Design of Baptism (Harb. '48, 614). Mr. Scott here did valiant service in his use of this doctrine in his evangelistic work (Harb. '49, 48).

This work was the next great factor in the progress of the movement. Having been commissioned by the Mahoning Association in 1827 and filled with great enthusiasm for the cause, Scott flashed as a meteor throughout the Western Reserve. He first brought in numbers and convinced the Reformers that something could be done in the way of a popular movement.

Meanwhile the conflict in the Redstone Association came to a crisis. Several churches of this Association, under the influence of Mr. Campbell, had grown to prize their creeds less and their Bibles more. There was, however, an article in the old constitution of the Association which required that the churches in writing their letters should refer to the Philadelphia Confession of Faith (C. B. 276). This constitution had been a dead letter of late years, but in 1826 it was revived by the enemies of Mr. Campbell, who came early on the ground, organized the association with the ten churches which they controlled, and then, when the letters from the other fourteen churches were presented, handed them back as unconstitutional because they did not conform to the article above-stated. In this way they captured the association, and proceeded immediately to excommunicate the nonconforming churches for whatever heresies they pleased to trump up. Elders Henry Spears and Matthias Luce, who had grown gray in the Baptist cause, were caught in the slaughter (C. B. 276). When the members of the excluded churches saw it was no use to protest, they met at a house near, heard a discourse from Mr. Campbell, who was present as a fraternal delegate of the Mahoning Association, resolved to go home, report progress and to return the next month to Washington in order to form a new Association. This was done. It is needless to say that in the constitution of this, the Washington Association, no mention was made of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith; but instead the following article was inserted: "We receive the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice to all the churches of Christ" (Rich. Mem. II, 166). This

model was followed by the congregations in turn, and thus fourteen more churches were added to the Reformation.

Meanwhile, the opposite course was being worked out in the Mahoning Association. There Walter Scott had been received cordially, and was supported by practically the entire membership. This whole association espoused the cause of the Reformers,—four small congregations withdrawing. Thus a great force was gained to the movement.

Likewise, divisions occurred in the associations of Kentucky and Virginia. In both States the Reformers gained many of the largest churches and most respected ministers, including Jacob Creath, Sr., D. S. Burnett and Raccoon John Smith.

The war was now carried into local churches. The four churches which withdrew from the Mahoning Association formed themselves, together with some scattered churches north of Pittsburg, into the Beaver Association (C. B. 659). This association issued a circular anathematizing the Mahoning Association and Mr. Campbell for "damnable heresies." Mr. Campbell attacked this anathema as false and slanderous, but it was copied by Baptist papers over the country and the work of exclusion began (C. B. original vol. VII, 183-4; Harb. '30, 174-7). The Appomattox and Dover Decrees were important documents of this war (See Gates' Revelation and Separation, chapter on "Separation"). Mr. Campbell saw that he could not prevent the storm, and bowed before it. He remained calm and undisturbed at home, and gave what comfort he could to his followers through his magazines. He reviewed the whole period in two articles entitled "Reformers, not Schismatics" (Harb. '37, 145-51, 193-9), in which he maintained that he and his friends were the "separated rather than separatists;" that in no instance had a majority of Reformers ever cast out a minority of Baptists, but that the opposite had often happened (Harb. '37, 149). This schism occurred within the years 1830-3. That which the Reformers had been trying to avoid for twenty years, viz., the forming of a separate religious party, was forced upon them. Under the sting of the treatment received from Baptist Associations, and finding no precedent for such organizations in the Scriptures, they disbanded the Mahoning, Washington, Stillwater and other associations and became merely independent churches. This they remained until the organization of missionary societies, State and national, in the years 1845-50. Thus the union with the Baptists had proved to be of doubtful expediency, and had been fraught with endless turmoil. Mr. Campbell clung to it, however, with stubborn tenacity, and had gained thereby an audience as large as the nation, and a following which when cast forth was able to begin with

a ministry, churches, members and organs of publications so as to command attention and respect from the beginning (Harb. '37, 150).

The Christians.

We shall pass over this branch of the Current Reformation with only the briefest sketch; not that it is less important than the others, but that our search is for the rise of doctrines and principles. This branch brought in numbers and the evangelistic spirit. It has little significance on the doctrinal side.

The "Christians" or "Christian Connection," as they were often called, were themselves a composite people. They arose out of the religious conditions of America immediately succeeding the Revolutionary War. In the Carolinas, James O'Kelly led a party of Methodists who refused to submit to the episcopacy of Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury and were called at first "Republican Methodists," but later repudiated that name for the simple title "Christians" (Rich. Mem. II, 185). Likewise, in New England, Abner Jones and Elias Smith led out parties of Baptists who assumed the same name (Ibid. II, 186). But most important is the group of "Christians" gathered around Barton W. Stone, formerly a Presbyterian minister of Kentucky. In the West these parties, coming out of three leading denominations, found themselves to be in practical agreement as to their views, and so coalesced under the title "Christian Connection" (Ibid II, 198). Here also they met the reformation led by Alexander Campbell, and took relation *pro* or *con* to this movement.

This relation concerns itself especially with Barton W. Stone, whose life and work we shall sketch in brief:

Barton Warren Stone was born in Maryland, 1772. He attended school at Guilford C. H., N. C., where he was converted under the preaching of James McGready. He soon became a candidate for the ministry under the Orange Presbytery, but fell into doubt on the doctrines of Election and Reprobation and of the Trinity; he went for a time to Georgia where he taught the classical languages, but later returned and took up his life work. He soon migrated to Kentucky, where he was settled with the Presbyterian churches at Cane Ridge and Concord. Here he was when the evangelistic wave swept over the country in 1801-2. Mr. Stone entered heartily into the revival. With his churches occurred one of those great pioneer camp-meetings, at which 25,000 people were estimated to have been in attendance; nearly a thousand persons were converted, and the jerks and other enthusiastic phenomena which had accompanied the preaching of Whitefield were manifold. Mr. Stone says of this meeting (Chr. Mess. I, 77):—

"The doctrine preached by all was simple, and nearly the same. Free and full salvation to every creature was proclaimed. All urged faith in the gospel, and obedience to it, as the way of life. All appeared deeply impressed with the ruined state of sinners, and were anxious for their salvation. The spirit of partyism, and party distinctions, were apparently forgotten. The doctrines of former controversy were not named; no mention was made of eternal, unconditional election, reprobation or fatality. The spirit of love, peace and union were revived. You might have seen the various sects engaged in the same spirit, praying, praising and communing together, and the preachers in the lead. Happy days! joyful seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord! This work from this period spread throughout the western country."

But this was a state of affairs the sects of the time were illy prepared for. Consequently, some of Mr. Stone's fellow-ministers opposed the work and doctrines of the revival; took up the slogan for the dogmas of Calvinism which brought on a war with the other sects; and finally, Richard McNemar, one of the preachers, was held for trial before his presbytery on the charge of Arminianism (Ibid. I, 78). It was a test case, was taken up by all the friends of the revival and resulted in the withdrawal of five ministers (Stone one of the number) and the formation of the Springfield Presbytery (Ibid. I, 104). These seceders were formally suspended from the ministry and deposed from their churches; but, like Thomas Campbell, continued in their functions as ministers and gathered around them a considerable party. But they had now to answer the reproach of forming a new sect, which was contrary to their purpose (Ibid. I, 241), and so in 1804 they published the "Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery" and disbanded (See Mem. of Stone 51; Chr. Mess. I, 241; Young's Hist. Doc. 19-26). This interesting document reads as follows (Young, 20):—

"We *will* that this body die, be dissolved and sink into union with the Body of Christ at large; for there is but one Body, and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling.

"We *will* that our name of distinction, with its *Reverend* title, be forgotten, that there be but one Lord over God's heritage, and his name One.

"We *will* that our power of making laws for the government of the church, and executing them by delegated authority, forever cease; that the people may have free course to the Bible, and adopt *the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.*"

and continues (Ibid. 21-2):—

"We *will* that the people henceforth take the Bible as the only sure guide to heaven; and as many as are offended with other books, which stand in competition with it, may cast them into the fire if they choose;

for it is better to enter into life having one book, than having many to be cast into hell."

From henceforth they called themselves "Christians" only.

About this time Mr. Stone again fell into doubt on the doctrine of the Atonement, as taught in the orthodox systems of the time. He did not find it in the Bible, nor did it harmonize with his belief that "God is Love, and Christ died for all." He accordingly gave it up (Chr. Mess. I, 243-5). Soon, too, millenarian ideas began to run riot in the revival communities, which were brought to a crisis by the arrival of some Shaker missionaries from New York. These, with their doctrine of "perfection in holiness," carried off McNemar and other leaders and decimated their ranks (Ibid. I, 263-4). Stone, however, stood firm on his original ground, and in the reading of his Bible saw that "immersion was the apostolic mode of baptism and that believers were the only proper subjects of it." At a conference of leaders, it was agreed that each individual act according to his own belief in this matter, by which rule the greater part of their number were baptized. Writing in 1827, Mr. Stone said: "Now there is not one in five hundred among us who has not been immersed." (Ibid. I, 267). Other divisions came; but in spite of all the Christians grew rapidly, and soon became an important people on the Western frontier.

In 1824, Stone met Alexander Campbell, then touring in Kentucky. They found their views in harmony in all essentials, although with marked theological differences. The acquaintance ripened into warm personal friendship; so that as the years went by the leaders of the two independent movements, as well as their followings, began to co-operate and approach each other. After the Reformers were cast out from the Baptists, a formal union was decided upon. John Smith, on the part of Campbell, and John Rogers, on that of Stone, went throughout Kentucky, gathered the Reformers and Christians together and organized them into single congregations. This work was accomplished in the years 1832-5, and remains as the most splendid illustration of the principle of Christian union in the history of the Current Reformation. In Ohio and the northwest, the union did not succeed; and in those States, the Christian Connection are yet a separate people.

The contribution of Stone and his friends was the evangelistic enthusiasm to which is due the rapid growth of the Disciples of Christ. Richardson well states this contribution in contrast to the work of the Reformers (Rich. Mem. II, 198-9):—

"While the features of this organization were thus, in a good measure, similar to those of the reformation in which Mr. Campbell was en-

gaged, there were some characteristic differences. With the former, the idea of uniting all men under Christ was predominant; with the latter, the desire of an exact conformity to the primitive faith and practice. The one occupied itself chiefly in casting abroad the sweep-net of the Gospel, which gathers fishes of every kind; the other was more intent upon collecting "the good into vessels" and casting "the bad away." Hence, the former engaged mainly in *preaching*, the latter in *teaching*. The revivalist machinery of protracted meetings, warm exhortation, personal entreaty, earnest prayers for conversion and union, accompanied by a belief in special spiritual operations and the use of the mourner's seat, existed with the one, while with the other the chief matters of interest were the disentanglement of the Christian faith from modern corruptions of it and the recovery of the Gospel ordinances and ancient order of things. There had been an almost entire neglect of evangelization on the part of its few churches which were originally connected with Mr. Campbell in his reformatory efforts. They had not a single itinerant preacher, and though they made great progress in biblical knowledge, they gained comparatively few converts. The churches of the Christian Connection, on the other hand, less inimical to speculative theories, granted membership to the unimmersed and free communion to all, and imperfectly acquainted with the order, discipline and institutions of the churches, made through an efficient itineracy large accessions everywhere and increased with surprising rapidity. They were characterized by a simplicity of belief and manners and a liberality of spirit highly captivating, and possessed, in general, a striking and praiseworthy readiness to receive additional light from the Bible. They gained over, consequently, from the religious community many of the pious and peaceloving, who groaned under the evils of sectarianism, while the earnest exhortations of zealous preachers and their direct personal appeal to sinners obtained large accessions from the world."

CONCLUSION.

1. Thus we believe that we have fairly maintained our thesis—that the Current Reformation arose from many independent sources as a providence of God; that these independent movements progressively approached each other, under the application of common principles; that this process was greatly accelerated through mutual recognition, by means of circular letters, central publications and personal messengers; that union has been time and again accomplished by formal agreement and coalition of forces. The acme of this process was reached in the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society, under the leadership of D. S. Burnett, in 1849. This became the mother of all our societies; which, while constituted merely for co-operative work, have become the bonds of the closest fellowship, and through the great conventions of the last decade are exercising a most marvelous unifying influence on the disparate factors and separate sections of our brother-

hood. Much yet remains to be done in the way of realizing both the ideals of the fathers and the purpose of God in this people; but the history of the past becomes the best lesson for the future. How shall the Lord's Prayer be realized? How shall God's people become one? As they *have become one* in the past—on the basis of the Bible in hope and prayer and work for the union of all Christians—let us expect that this "consummation devoutly to be wished" shall extend beyond its present borders, and let us place ourselves as clay in the Divine Potter's hands, responsive and resolute for the accomplishment of His will.

2. Here is evident the diverse names by which the representatives of the Current Reformation have been called. The English Brethren were called the Church of Christ. In New York and the Northeast, this term was applied to the congregation, while the people were called the Disciples of Christ or Disciples. The early followers of the Campbells were called the "Reformers." The followers of Stone were called "Christians." When the union was made, it was thought to be unnecessary to agree upon a uniform name. Hence in each section the old titles continued. In the years 1839-40, a warm controversy arose on the subject of the proper name. Walter Scott had taken the side of Stone, and championed the exclusive rights of the term "Christian" (Life of J. Smith, 541-5). Mr. Campbell answered in the Harbinger in a series of able articles on "Our Name" (Harb. '39 and '40). He preferred the designation "Disciples of Christ," but defended the right to the use of any Scriptural name. There the matter finally rested, so that in the North and East "Disciples of Christ" and "Church of Christ" have become the dominant terms; while in the South and West "Christians" and "Christian Churches" have gained the ascendency.

CHAPTER VI.

The Principles.

Like the Protestant Reformation which went before and furnished both motive and model for its successor (See p. 24), the Current Reformation was carried out on definite principles. The historic rise of these has been given in the preceding chapters. We have left over only the task of constructive statement.

But this task has been performed for us by Mr. Campbell himself. Early in the Christian Baptist, he began a series of articles on a Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things (C. B. 126, 133, 139, etc.). The text of this remarkable treatise was the Lord's High-priestly Prayer (John 17:20-1), (C. B. 135):

"Holy Father,—now, I do not pray for these only (for the unity and success of the apostles) but for those also who shall believe on me through or by means of their word—that they all may be one—that the world may believe that you have sent me." Who does not see in this petition that the words or testimony of the apostles, the unity of the disciples and the conviction of the world are bound together by the wisdom and the love of the Father, by the devotion and philanthropy of the Son. The order of heaven, the plan of the Great King, his throne and government, are here unfolded in full splendor to our view. The words of the apostles are laid as the basis, the unity of the disciples, the glorious result, and the only successful means of converting the world to the acknowledgment that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah or the Son of the Blessed, the only Saviour of men."

The same was stated on the same authority in the essay on the Foundation of Christian Union, incorporated in the volume called "Christianity Restored." (1835), later issued as the Christian System (Chr. Sys. 114):

"Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world but the union and co-operation of Christians.

"Nothing is essential to the union of Christians but the Apostles' teaching or testimony.

"Or does he choose to express the plan of the Self-Existent in other words? Then he may change the order, and say:—

"The testimony of the Apostles is the only and all-sufficient means of uniting all Christians.

"The union of Christians with the Apostles' testimony is all-sufficient and alone sufficient to the conversion of the world.

"Neither truth alone nor union alone is sufficient to subdue the unbelieving nations, but truth and union combined are omnipotent. They are *omnipotent,* for God is in them and with them, and has consecrated and blessed them for this very purpose.

"These two propositions have been stated, illustrated, developed (and shall I say proved?) in the 'Christian Baptist' and 'Millennial Harbinger,' to the conviction of thousands."

It is reiterated in the preface to this volume, in a review of the course of Protestantism (Chr. Sys. 5):—

"Since that time, the first effort known to us to abandon the whole controversy about creeds and reformations, and to *restore* primitive Christianity, or to build alone upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief corner, has been made.

"Tired of new creeds and new parties in religion, and of the numerous abortive efforts to reform the reformation; convinced from the Holy Scriptures, from observation and experience, that the union of the Disciples of Christ is essential to the conversion of the world, and that the correction and improvement of no creed or partisan establishment in Christendom could ever become the basis of such a union, communion and co-operation, as would restore peace to a church militant against itself, or triumph to the common salvation; a few individuals, about the commencement of the present century, began to reflect upon the ways and means to restore primitive Christianity."

This book was compiled by Mr. Campbell from his previous writings, in answer to the demand of his followers to have a concise statement of their leading positions, especially that they may ward off the objections of their opponents. Mr. Campbell, too, saw that the Reformation was in danger of drifting into a great variety of propaganda and did not hesitate to give it direction from his clearer insight. He says (Chr. Sys. 8):—

"The object of this volume is to place before the community in a plain, definite and perspicuous style the *capital principles* which have been elicited, argued out, developed and sustained in a controversy of *twenty-five years,* by the tongues and pens of those who rallied under the banners of the Bible alone.

"We flatter ourselves that the principles are now clearly and fully developed by the united efforts of a few devoted and ardent minds, who set out determined to sacrifice everything to truth and follow her wherever she might lead the way; I say, the principles on which the church of Jesus Christ—all believers in Jesus as the Messiah—can be united with honor to themselves and with blessings to the world; on which the gospel and its ordinances can be restored in all their primitive simplicity, excellency and power, and the church shine as a lamp that burneth to the conviction and salvation of the world:—I say, *the principles* by which these things can be done are now developed, as well as the *principles themselves,* which together constitute the original *gospel* and *order of things* established by the Apostles."

Thus, these principles are threefold:—

1. Conversion of the World.
2. Union of All Christians.
3. Restoration of Primitive Christianity.

These principles constituted the aim of the Current Reformation, are the basis of the Plea of the Disciples of Christ, and around them may be written the history of this interesting people. They were worked out in a long and painful process in conflict with the religious establishments of the time. They found Biblical sanction in the final prayer of Jesus, and are worthy of our consideration in every way as the statement of a highminded programme.

The relations of the principles to one another is evident in their conjunction:—

1. The Conversion of the World is the ultimate principle. It is the final purpose in the Lord's prayer "that the world may believe that Thou didst send me." It was the historic spring of the Current Reformation. This movement arose out of, and was the successor to, the great religious awakening of the Eighteenth Century, in its twofold phase of evangelism and missionary work. Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, George Whitefield, William Carey, Andrew Fuller, Robert Haldane, B. W. Stone, Thomas Campbell and Walter Scott were members of a common movement. They were closely akin in spirit, and bear the relation of earlier and later manifestations of the same religious impulse. Alexander Campbell was influenced least of all by the Great Awakening; and as the teacher of the Reformation, in his attempt to inculcate a rational view of Christianity, he often felt called upon to oppose the excesses of the revival (See p. 69). But he never ceased the advocacy of the largest and widest extension of missions and evangelism as the final goal of Christian activity. This is most aptly illustrated in his famous attitude to missionary societies. Mr. Campbell opposed these because he believed them to be the bulwarks of sectarianism, because he believed their efforts were futile and their methods contrary to the divine plan. He attacked them as the "good" which was the "enemy of the best." As he says (C. B. 135):—

"But the conversion of the world is planned and ordered by the will of heaven to be dependent upon the unity of the disciples as well as this unity dependent upon the apostle's testimony. An attempt to convert Pagans and Mahometans to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and the sent of the Father, until Christians are united, is also an attempt to frustrate the prayer of the Messiah, to subvert his throne and government. There are unalterable laws in the moral world, as in the natural. There are also unalterable laws in the government

of the moral and religious world, as in the government of the natural. Those laws cannot, by human interference, be set aside or frustrated—we might as reasonably expect that Indian corn will grow in the open fields in the midst of the frost and snows of winter, as that Pagan nations can be converted to Jesus Christ, till Christians are united through the belief of the apostle's testimony. We may force corn to grow by artificial means in the depth of winter, but it is not like the corn of August. So may a few disciples be made in Pagan lands by such means in the moral empire; as those by which corn is made to grow in winter in the natural empire, but they are not like the disciples of primitive times, before sectarian creeds came into being. It is enough to say, on this topic, that the Saviour made the unity of the disciples essential to the conviction of the world; and he that attempts it independent of this essential, sets himself against the wisdom and plans of heaven, and aims at overruling the dominion and government of the Great King."

Over against this improper method he presents what he held to be the proper one for the spread of the Gospel (C. B. 16):—

"The association, called the Church of Jesus Christ, is in *propria forma,* the only institution of God left on earth to illuminate and reform the world. That is, to speak in the most definitive and intelligible manner, a society of men and women, having in their hands the oracles of God; believing in their hearts the gospel of Jesus Christ; confessing the truth of Christ with their lips; exhibiting in their lives the morality of the Gospel, and walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blamelessly, in the sight of all men. When spiritual men, i. e., men having spiritual gifts, or, as now termed, miraculous gifts, were withdrawn, this institution was left on earth, as the grand scheme of Heaven, to enlighten and reform the world.

"If, in the present day, and amongst all those who talk so much of a missionary spirit, there could be found such a society, though it were composed of but twenty, willing to emigrate to some heathen land, where they would support themselves like the natives, wear the same garb, adopt the country as their own, and profess nothing like a missionary project; should such a society sit down and hold forth in word and deed the saving truth, not deriding the gods nor the religion of the natives, but allowing their own works and example to speak for their religion, and practicing as above hinted; we are persuaded that, in process of time, a more solid foundation for the conversion of the natives would be laid, and more actual success resulting, than from all the missionaries employed for twenty-five years."

I am sure that most of us feel that Mr. Campbell was mistaken in this view; that it will not do to get the work of uniting and reforming all done before that of missions begins, that the burden of support and responsibility should by no means rest on the devoted few who are willing to go. But we have no right to impugn the missionary motives

of Alexander Campbell. His reliance was on the proclamation of the truth, not on organization. He gave his support heartily to the work of the Bible societies. He preached everywhere without compensation. He devoted himself continually to the most arduous service, for which he could have had no other motive than the constraining love of Jesus Christ and the desire to carry out his great commission.

Thus the missionary motive has ever been dominant among the Disciples of Christ. Their Foreign Society is the most successful of their organizations. Continuous evangelism has marked their progress from Barton W. Stone and Walter Scott to the present day. This, far more than superior methods or a superior knowledge of the truth, accounts for the marvelous increase in numbers of this people. Every sermon must close with an exhortation and be followed by an invitation. It must be practical; it must move. Nothing is good which will not help to convert the world. Every preacher and every church must get results, or they are considered to encumber the ground. The practical test of the truth is the final criterion. Every shade of opinion is tolerated, unless it destroys the usefulness of its holder. No time is lost in abstract and speculative questions. All this is no accident, no mere device of men, however wise we may think them to be, but alone has its rationale far back in an intense yearning for souls which has been both spring and stay of this movement.

2. The Union of all Christians is the *material principle.* It is the mediate purpose in the Lord's prayer, "that they may all be one." It is the means to the end. When all Christians are united, we believe that we can work effectively for the conversion of the world. It was the task, the problem before the fathers of this Reformation, which they were trying to solve, and by working at which they came to their other ideas. Thomas Campbell is its patron saint.

Like all the principles, this had its anti-element. Its antithesis is found in the divided state of Christendom at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. It meant to be corrective of sectarianism, and to heal the divisions of the Church. It interpreted the Lord's Prayer not as meaning a mere unity of spirit or anything else which palliated the evils of schism and excused the existing order. "That they may be one" was taken to mean what it said,—"of one mind and accord; of one body, the Body of Christ." It meant alliance and co-operation. It was the motto of a genuine and a real reform, not less in importance than the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. It was the shibboleth of a Current Reformation. In this movement, our fathers hoped to destroy all sects and the sect spirit, and to restore into one the church

as it was in the Apostolic Age. This is well understood and leads us to the next.

3. The Restoration of Primitive Christianity is the formal principle. It was the immediate purpose of the Lord's Prayer, "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me, through their word." This was the method of union. It presented the programme of the Reformation. It was the Plea of the Reformers to Christians of all bodies. It was the work of preparation, the immediate task and duty of the Disciples until the day of the Lord's power, seen in the massing of Christian forces and the advance on the heathen world, should be at hand.

But it must be carefully inquired into as to what is meant by the Restoration of Primitive Christianity. A restoration of some sort had been implied in the formal principle of Protestantism, viz., the Authority of the Scriptures. This appeal from the traditions and dogmas of the Church, to the Bible, and Bible alone, as the religion of Protestants, called back to a life of faith in God's Word not then present in the Catholic practice. But certainly Luther and his associates, in incorporating the Greek dogmas and formulating creeds, although these documents were meant at first not to be standards of faith but only defences of the same, were not consistent with this position. The confessions of faith, although drawn from the Scriptures and meant merely to be compendiums of them, came to be a substitute for the same. Mapped out by the human eye in definite historic situations, they more and more tended to make void the Word of God by their traditions. This course went on until the standard of revolt was raised and a new cry was made for the Restoration of Primitive Christianity. The honor of primacy here must go to John Glas, who attacked the Scottish Covenants in 1725-30. But Glas, Sandeman, A. McLean, James A. Haldane, Alexander Carson, John Walker, Alexander Campbell and Benjamin Franklin were one movement,—a revolt against ecclesiasticism in the realms of both polity and theology.

This movement, like the Great Reformation out of which it sprang, was carried on as a strict *return to Scripture*. As Mr. Campbell says, "the Bible alone is the Bible only, in word and deed, in profession and practice" (Chr. Sys. 6).

Hence, the Restoration of Primitive Christianity did not mean a return to the life of the early church in its empiric reality, as that life itself was often condemned in the Scriptures themselves, as in Paul's letters to the Corinthians. On the other hand, it meant the life of the primitive church in its ideal phases, in conformance with the commands

of Jesus and His apostles, in precedents mentioned and approved by the inspired writers. As Mr. Campbell again says (C. B. 128) :—

"To bring the societies of Christians up to the New Testament, is just to bring the disciples individually and collectively, to walk in the faith, and in the commandments of the Lord and Saviour, as presented in that blessed volume; and this is to restore the ancient order of things."

The content put into this principle was quite variant with its various advocates. The followers of Glas attempted to restore New Testament practices with casuistic detail. Mr. Campbell criticised them for missing the spirit of the principle and bringing the movement into reproach (C. B. 450, 658). He rejected the practices of the holy kiss, washing of feet, etc., as not required in a proper understanding of the Scripture (C. B. 224, 282). The restoration for which he pleaded was more doctrinal in character. As he says in his reply to William Jones (Harb. '35, 109) :—

"If I were to classify in *three* chapters the whole Christian institution, after the fashion of the modern school, for the sake of being understood, I would designate them Christian *faith,* Christian *worship* and Christian *morality.* To these the moderns have added two others; which, using the same license, I would call human *philosophy* and human *traditions.* Now in the first chapter we, and all Christians, are agreed: for as Christian faith has respect to the *matters of fact* recorded,—to the direct testimony of God found in the New Testament concerning himself—concerning his Son and Spirit—concerning mankind—what he has done, what we have done, and what he will do, there is no debate. I find all *confessions of* FAITH, properly so called, like the *four* gospels, tell the same story so far as matters of fact or faith are concerned.

"In the second chapter we are also agreed that God is to be worshipped through the Mediator—in prayer, in praise, public and private—in the ordinances of Christian baptism, the Lord's day, the Lord's supper, and in the devotional study of his word and of his works of creation and providence.

"In the third chapter we all acknowledge the same moral code. What is morality is confessed and acknowledged by all; but in the practice of it there are great subtractions.

"We repudiate the two remaining chapters as having any place in our faith, worship or morality; because we think that we have discovered that all the divisions in Protestant Christendom—that all the partyism, vain jangling and heresies which have disgraced the Christian profession, have emanated from human philosophy and human tradition. It is not faith, nor piety, nor morality; but philosophy and tradition that have alienated and estranged Christians and prevented the conversion of the world."

This principle, even more than the second, had a strong anti-element. It found in the religious conditions of the world certain abuses and errors which it meant to correct. For this purpose, it set forth a definite programme, of which the items were the following:—

1. No Creeds.

Mr. Campbell says (C. B. 133):—

"Now, in attempting to accomplish this, it must be observed, that it belongs to every individual and to every congregation of individuals to discard from their faith and their practice everything that is not found written in the New Testament of the Lord and Saviour, and to believe and practice whatever is there enjoined. This done, and everything is done which ought to be done.

"But to come to the things to be discarded, we observe that, in the ancient order of things, there were no creeds or compilations of doctrine in abstract terms, nor in other terms other than the terms adopted by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Therefore all such are to be discarded."

Thus creeds are held to be divisive, and the first stone of stumbling in the way of union. In the room of the standards, the New Testament should be placed as the constitution of the Kingdom of the Saviour; for admission into which the only requirement should be the belief that Jesus is the Messiah and Lord of all, and an act of naturalization, viz., baptism, by which is renounced spiritual allegiance to any other. The right to ask any other questions is denied (C. B. 140, 159).

2. Bible Names for Bible Things.

Thus the whole nomenclature of scholastic divinity must be rejected, and a complete restoration be made of the inspired vocabulary. This was considered a matter of the utmost importance. Since words have an imposing influence on ideas, and all correct ideas of God and things invisible are supernatural ideas, no other terms can so suitably express them as the terms adopted by the Holy Spirit. A sample of these objectionable words is given (C. B. 159):—

"Such are the following: Trinity. First, second, and third person in the adorable Trinity: God the Son; and God the Holy Ghost. Eternal Son. The Son is eternally begotten by the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. The *divinity* of *Jesus Christ;* the humanity of Jesus Christ; the incarnation of Jesus Christ. This he said as man; and that as God. The common operations, and the special operations of the Spirit of God. Original sin, and original righteousness. Spiritual death; spiritual life. Covenant of works, covenant of grace, and covenant of redemption; a dispensation of the covenant of grace, and administration of the covenant. Effectual calling. Free will. Free grace. Total depravity. Eternal justification. Eternal sleep. Elect world. Elect infants. Light of nature. Natural

religion. General and particular atonement. Legal and evangelical repentance. Moral, ceremonial, and judicial law. Under the law as a covenant of works, and as a rule of life. Christian sabbath. Holy sacrament. Administration of the sacrament. Different kinds of faith and grace. Divine service; the public worship of God," &c., &c.

These all must be abandoned as the language of Ashdod, and the pure speech of the sacred writers must be restored. Along with these must go the use of Biblical terms in a non-Biblical sense (C. B. 160) :—

"Of this sort are the following: The natural man, spiritual man; in the flesh, in the spirit; regeneration, washing of regeneration; ministration of the Spirit, demonstration of the Spirit; power of God, faith of the operation of God, the grace of God; the letter, the spirit; the old and new covenant; word of God; the ministry of the word; truth of the Gospel; mystery, election, charity, heretic, heresy, blasphemy, church communion, baptism, faith, etc., etc., etc."

"The adoption and constant use of this barbarous dialect, was the cause of making divisions, and is still one existing cause of their continuance."

3. Primitive Order of Worship.

This was based on Acts 2:42: "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." This approved precedent was held to be the law for worship, which was thus divinely ordained and was uniform in the Christian assemblies (C. B. 166). The Lord's Supper was the core of this service. As such, it should be observed weekly.

4. Primitive Organization.

"This is an independent congregation, which has the right to call, appoint, or ordain any person to any office laid down in the volume, and to do all the acts and deeds thereto appertaining, without calling to their aid the assistance of any foreign deacon, bishop or officer. (C. B. 261.)"

Thus all superintending judicatories, of whatever kind, are rejected. The officers of this independent church are (1) Bishops, who perform the twofold function of presiding and teaching (C. B. 232), and (2) Deacons, who had charge of the Lord's treasury (C. B. 335).

5. Primitive Discipline.

This was a strict application of the requirements of the Scriptures, of which the officers were only interpreters and executors, but of which the Lord is the only Legislator (C. B. 429). Every requirement was received with "the unfeigned and vehement desire to know the will of the Lord in order to do it." This was the essence of the spirit of ancient Christians.

These items constituted the chief points in the programme of Restoration. It was in the application of this principle Alexander Campbell proved the most adept. He says (C. B. 295):—

"When any act of devotion or item of religious practice presented itself to my view, of which I could learn nothing from my Master's Last Will and Testament, I simply gave it up; and if I found anything there not exhibited by my fellow-Christians, I went into the practice of it, if it was the practice of an individual, and if it was a social act I attempted to invite others to unite with me in it. Thus I went on correcting my views, and returning to his institutes until I became so speckled a bird that scarce one of any species would cordially consociate with me; but I gained ample remuneration in the pursuit, and got a use of my wings which I never before experienced. Thus, too, I was led into a secret, which as I received freely I communicate freely. It is this: There is an ancient and a modern order of things in the Lord's house."

Such were the principles of the Current Reformation, as we can gather them from their best sources.

There remains for us only to make such observations and exhortations as these outlines will warrant in our humble judgment:—

1. The fathers of this movement did not consider themselves as starting Christianity *de novo*. They recognized the legitimacy in the main of the traditional systems, especially of Protestantism out of which they had their own origin, but sought to correct some of the evident abuses in the popular religion. Thus they called back to the Word of God, which they found embodied in the first forms of Christianity as it came from its divine founder. In no sense did they limit the number of the truly Christian to their own body. They mingled fully and freely with the Christians of all the sects, in the hope of showing them the way of the Lord more perfectly and in the effort of leading them out of their divisions and supineness into a victorious force, united in the will of their Lord.

2. The history of the Disciples of Christ may be written in the terms of these principles. The formation of this people resulted from the attempts of Christian men of all the sects to grasp and maintain these principles. The development of the Disciples may also be gathered under the same laws. Our English Churches, under direct influences from their Scotch Baptist predecessors, have emphasized the Third Principle almost to the total exclusion of the others. The same is true of our Australian, Canadian, early New York, Tennessean and (I am told) some of our Texas brethren. Certainly there are many individuals in all these sections who do not have this attitude, but this is the dominant type in each of these groups; at least, it is the note we

who are afar off are most permitted to hear. If I were to ask a typical representative of these sections of our brotherhood, "What is the mission and plea of the Church of Christ"—it would probably not do to say "Christian Churches"—he would, I take it, frankly answer, "the Restoration of Primitive Christianity," and be confident that he stated the whole of it. "God will take care of the conversion of the heathen and the union of Christians (if there be any such outside our body) in his own good time; our duty is to stick to 'the law and the testimony.' We are against all compromise and innovation." If I pitch my tent toward the great windy city of the Great Lakes region, with, however, much of the feeling Lot had when he approached Sodom, and ask one of that group of brilliant men who by the kindness of some of our papers have held the public eye for the last decade, "What is the mission and plea of the Disciples of Christ"—I must call them this—I believe he would firmly say, "Christian Union." At least the emphasis is rightly placed there. "That understanding of the message of the Fathers which separates us from the great mass of the Lord's people"—and he does not doubt that they *are* the Lord's people—"is a mistake, however literally it may follow Apostolic models. Our true place is in the midst of all Christian activity, and we ought to be there with our plea for unity and fellowship." Between these extremes may be gathered most of the other positions. The Lexington School, the Cincinnati School, the St. Louis School and (may I say) the California School,—Each of these hold more or less firmly to the two principles, approaching at one time one extreme, at another, another; varying as the different questions arise.

The same variety of emphasis has characterized the different periods of our history. Thomas Campbell began with 'Christian Union' emblazoned on our standards. Unions were numerous,—an attempted union with the Presbyterians, union with the Baptists, union of Reformers and Christians. This principle is the key to our early history. Alexander Campbell then raised higher and higher the emblem of Restoration. The Mahoning Association was abandoned; our churches became strictly independent. Lines betwen the Reformed and the sects were strictly drawn. The Jews had no dealings with Samaritans. This shaded into the Civil War period, from out the gloom of which appeared two great heroes—Benjamin Franklin and J. W. McGarvey. These were but the natural successors of Mr. Campbell and did an enormous work, one as an evangelist and the other as a teacher, for their day and generation. Their entire work has been marked by a strict conformity to the Scriptures as they understood them. Over against this tendency

there arose mighty men,—Isaac Errett, A. McLean, J. H. Garrison; who have felt that the First, if not the Second Principle was in danger of being neglected. The call has been for missions and co-operation. By no means does the honor of these movements go only to the men I have named, but each has had around him a group of friends and helpers whom time forbids me to mention. The last decade has been marked by the appearance of a group of young men; who, in addition to the training of our colleges, have availed themselves of the higher education of the great American Universities; H. L. Willett may be mentioned as one of this type. These men, as a rule, have a keen sense of the essential Christianity of our religious neighbors. They feel that great advancement has been made toward the realization of the Lord's Prayer, both without and within, since the beginning of this movement. They are ardent advocates of Christian Union. This great principle is certainly to the forefront in all conferences of our brethren.

In fact, ours is an age of uncommon mental activity. We are in the midst of a melee on the holding and application of our principles. Not a few will be found who are setting up a camp and crying, "Lo here, lo there." I suggest that we go not out to any of them, and that the solution of the problems of our day is to be found in standing firmly by the foundation of our fathers, viz.:

3. Hold the three principles together, intact, and in the proper relation to one another. The Conversion of the World is the goal. Nothing which is not rightly and truly missionary has a place in this Reformation. We should measure all our acts and tenets by the test: "Do they help to realize the Lord's Prayer—'that the world may believe that Thou didst send me'?" The Union of Christians is the means to the end. Do our acts or tenets tend to Union? If not so, let us not be too sure that we are doing God's will, even if we read it out of the Book. We have no right to get off in a corner by ourselves, even if we may have the truth or the pure speech or the primitive practice, and hug these treasures to our breasts, saying, "We are better than thou." Our duty is to be in the currents of the world's history, to be there to bear our part of the burdens and to make our contribution as I believe God has given us to do. Separatism and divisiveness is a sin, no less for the unionist than for the sectarian. Such were not the doings of the Fathers. The Restoration of Primitive Christianity is the method of union. We have never believed that the joining of all the sects in one grand army is the great desideratum, but that each individual should study his New Testament and copy therefrom the life of the Early Christians before party standards and barriers were set up. Restora-

tion is the first and most immediate duty. Let us see that we restore the ancient spirit as well as the letter, and we can make no mistake in holding strictly to this principle.

4. Too much must not be made of the negative side of the Principle of Restoration. From this has grown the whole controversy on missionary societies, the organ, Sunday Schools, Christian Endeavor, Higher Education, etc. I am sure that the position of our so-called Anti-brethren—and I use the term with no sort of derision, but with the highest respect—is one of great consistency and sincerity and loyalty to the truth. Yet, on the other hand, I believe as firmly that this position is a mistake,—a mistake not in its aims and purposes, but in its understanding of the New Testament. This book, whch is our guide in all matters of faith and practice, is not a series of rules and detail regulations. That was Judaism, from which Jesus came to free us, and of which Paul teaches that we are not under Law but under Grace. It is certainly right to obey any Apostolic command, when that is properly understood; but we should not obey as a strict legalism, but as a free deed of love. No less is the Christian liberty we have even toward the Apostles. The wanting of a command in a thousand specific cases in no sense releases us from our Christian duty as interpreted by the spirit of Christ. The same care must be exercised in the principle of Apostolic precedent. It is certainly right to follow any clear practice of the early Christians. But the absence of a precedent should never be taken as a prohibition of a practice which in other ways is in harmony with the Christian spirit. The mistake here is another misunderstanding of the New Testament. There is only one book of Apostolic precedents, viz., the Acts of the Apostles. When we examine this book, we see that it in no case aims to give the total of Apostolic practice. It is on the other hand a history of early Christian missions. Its theme, as definitely stated by its author (Acts 1:8), is to show how the Gospel spread from Jerusalem out through Judea and Samaria to the uttermost parts of the earth. The book only gives the new departures in a series of breakings away from the bonds of Judaism. The Acts are a history with a purpose,—that purpose is the vindication of the Apostle to the Gentiles and of the message to which he gave his life. The early Christians did ten thousand things of which we have no record, any one of which would be a good Apostolic precedent if we had it. "These things are written for admonition unto those to whom the ends of time have come." But the silence of the Scripture is in no case a mandatory law. The whole cry of innovation is to be answered just as Isaac Errett did it,—by showing how the objectors do hundreds

of things in their worship and practice for which they have no warrant whatever in Scripture. We should not identify the order of the backwoods of America with that of the First Century, whatever may be the lessons we have learned from it. We need historic perspective in all questions of this kind.

5. We ought to discourage all attempts to draw lines between the various factors and tendencies of this great brotherhood. I confess myself in fellowship with all and intend to stay in this fellowship. I sit down at the Lord's Table in crude cabin of our out-of-the-way sections with the same delight with which I can enjoy the elegant service of our city churches. The people who take the Bible as their guide are *my* people; the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is their God, is *my* God. Our differences are differences of culture, and they are being rapidly overcome with increase in acquaintance and the general education of the American people. This is not to say that there are no errors in theology in our brotherhood. But the best combatant of error is the truth. If anyone is mistaken in his views, there are those who will arise to set him right. At least, we may be sure that the false doctrine will not have a wide extent and will soon pass away, as an eddy in the main current in the progress of God's truth.

My corrective of the ills of our brotherhood is fellowship,—fellowship of the rich and poor, of the north and south, of the learned and unlearned, of the orthodox and heretic. When we know each other better, and love each other more, our differences will disappear, as the mist before the morning sun; and the Sun of Righteousness will arise with healings on his wings.

6. I believe we have vindicated the title of this book. The movement of the Disciples of Christ is a Restoration as far as it relates to the teachings of the New Testament. It is also a Reformation, as it affects the conditions of Modern Christianity. This was the original term for the movement of the whole. Restoration was only one phase,—a part of its programme. Reformation emphasizes Christian Union,—a work to be accomplished through Restoration. The Current Reformation, in contrast to the Protestant Reformation and as a complement of the same, is the larger and better term. As yet this work is in its incipiency. It is destined to grow. In the coming centuries, when all Christians shall be one and the great First Principle shall receive due attention and the kingdoms of the world shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and Christ, it will be a revolution.

7. But it may be objected that we make too little of Christ in all this programme, that nothing is said of Loyalty to Christ, Authority

of Christ, the Divinity of Christ, etc. I would answer that if it appears so it is only appearance. The terms which I have used have been sanctified by a long course of history. There is no real gain in changing. To appeal to the New Testament is to appeal to Christ. Jesus is the alpha and omega, the center and circumference, the spring and the stay of the whole volume. I am suspicious of any cry "Back to Christ," which is not a cry "back to the literature which God in His providence has given us about the Christ." As I would not take the long journey of the traditions of the church, I would not take the short cut of rationalistic criticism. The Christ outside of or apart from the Book, if such were possible, is not the Christ for me. I believe that in accepting the teachings, faith and practices of the New Testament, I have the highest loyalty to Christ and the utmost confidence in His authority and the firmest belief in His divinity.

8. Restoration will do little good if it does not carry with it a better study of the Scriptures. The motto of Thomas Campbell would have been worth little if his knowledge of the Scriptures had stood at a standstill. Alexander Campbell accomplished so much because he applied himself so long and so closely to the study of the Bible. It is not enough for us merely to rely upon the researches of the Fathers. God has much more light to break forth from His Holy Book. If we do not use our eyes for seeing, they become atrophied, and we become blind even to the light we have. Let no man delude himself that he is being true to this reformation in merely applying the meagre knowledge he had when he espoused it, or which he inherited from his forbears. New texts have been unearthed and published since the days of Alexander Campbell. The monuments have laid bare their treasures. A vast historical research is going on all around us. The historical method is the key to all knowledge in our times. The greatest need of the Disciples of Christ to-day, as I understand it, is that love for and study of the Scriptures which marked our early history, when the Bible was the constant companion of the man at the plough or in the workshop, and of the woman in her kitchen or garden. If it were possible, I would pray that God would restore to us the simple virtues. While I know it is not possible for us to return to the primitive conditions of the American frontier, yet we can restore the Bible in our schools and colleges, in our homes and social circles. We can be blessed by a rich, full, free knowledge of God's Word, which is meat indeed and drink indeed to our needy souls.

And this chapter can come rightfully to a close only by a call to the New Testament, whence came the motive and guidance of this great

movement, from which its heroes derived strength and sustenance, and by abiding with which alone we can hope to accomplish God's will in the prayer of His Son that they all may be one, that the world "may believe that Thou didst send me."

CHAPTER VII.

Principles of Interpretation.

Closely related to the Principles of the Current Reformation were the Principles of Interpretation by which the New Testament order was to be obtained. Alexander Campbell was almost wholly responsible for the emphasis on this phase of the movement. By its application, he became the great scholar and teacher of the Reformation. He early saw that little could be accomplished in the way of reform if the popular methods of text preaching and reading the dogmas into the Scriptures were left as the key of knowledge. Hence he inveighed against them in sharp language. When asked what he had to substitute for that which he would tear away, he said (C. B. 32) :—

"We have no system of our own, nor of others, to substitute in lieu of the reigning systems. We only aim at substituting the New Testament in lieu of every creed in existence; whether Mahometan, Pagan, Jewish, or Sectarian. We wish to call Christians to consider that Jesus Christ has made them kings and priests to God. We neither advocate Calvinism, Arminianism, Arianism, Socinianism, Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Deism, or Sectarianism, but *New Testamentism.*"

He then gave a method for his humble readers to use in learning the truth of the sacred volume. He says (C. B. 32) :—

"You will then take, say a New Testament, and sit down with a pencil or pen in your hand. Begin with Matthew's gospel; read the whole of it at one reading, or two; mark on the margin every sentence you think you do not understand. Turn back again; read it a second time, in less portions at once than in the first reading; cancel such marks as you have made which noted passages, that, on the first reading appeared to you dark or difficult to understand, but on the second reading opened to your view. Then read Mark, Luke, and John, in the same manner, as they all treat upon the same subject. After having read each evangelist in this way, read them all in succession a third time. At this time you will no doubt be able to cancel many of your marks. Thus read the Acts of the Apostles, which is the key to all the Epistles; then the Epistles in a similar manner; always before reading an epistle, read every thing said about the people addressed in the epistle, which you find in the Acts of the Apostles. This is the course which we would take to understand any book."

This method, accompanied by earnest prayer, will yield the secrets of God's Word. It will be aided, however, by a common effort (C. B. 33) :—

"It will add, however, exceedingly to your advantage, should you find two, three, ten or a dozen similarly disposed, who will meet and read and converse and pray with you, and you with them once a week; or should you be the member of a church walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord."

But he is equally strong in his caveat (C. B. 33):—

"Beware of having any commentator or system before your eyes or your mind. Open the New Testament as if mortal man had never seen it before. Your acquaintance with the Old Testament will incalculably facilitate your proficiency in the New. The time requisite will be redeemed time. It will not interfere with your ordinary duties."

This was the method by which Mr. Campbell obtained his own knowledge (C. B. 229):—

"For the last ten years I have not looked into the works of any of these men (Glas, Sandeman, etc.); and have lost the taste which I once had for controversial reading of this sort. And during this period my inquiries into the Christian religion have been almost exclusively confined to the holy scriptures. And I can assure you that the scriptures, when made their own interpreter, and accompanied with earnest desires to the author of these writings, have become, to me, a book entirely new, and unlike what they were when read and consulted as a book of reference—I call no man master upon the earth; and although my own father has been a diligent student, and teacher of the Christian religion since his youth; and, in my opinion, understands this book as well as any person with whom I am acquainted, yet there is no man with whom I have debated more, and reasoned more, on all subjects of this kind, than he—I have been so long disciplined in the school of free inquiry, that, if I know my own mind, there is not a man upon the earth whose authority can influence me, any farther than he comes with the authority of evidence, reason, and truth. To arrive at this state of mind is the result of many experiments and efforts; and to me has been arduous beyond expression. I have endeavored to read the scriptures as though no one had read them before me; and I am as much on my guard against reading them to-day, through the medium of my own views yesterday, or a week ago, as I am against being influenced by any foreign name, authority, or system, whatever."

He desired every one of his brethren to have the same liberty. Especially did he guard against preconceived opinions, by which it is so easy for us to betray the truth. Accordingly, in his compendium "Christianity Restored," he gave a prominent place to the Principles of Interpretation. He says in the Preface (Chr. Rest. 13):—

"Our views and attainments in the knowledge of Christianity, such as they are, are, we think, the necessary results of our premises and principles of interpretation. Certain it is, that by them we were led into those views of the ancient gospel and order of things, which we were enabled to exhibit in the publications of the year 1823. While we

state this fact distinctively to arrest the attention of the reader to a candid and jealous examination of them, we would not be understood as alleging, that all who have since embraced these views, or who now contend for them, are indebted to our labors for their knowledge of original Christianity. The same principles of interpretation have led others to the same conclusions from the same premises; and thus have we been mutually helpers to one another. The momentous importance of some of our conclusions, we humbly think, entitle our premises and principles of interpretation, to a strict and impartial consideration; and this is all the favor we petition from any reader into whose hands this volume may happen to fall."

Thus the Principles of Interpretation constituted the first chapter. The essay is an extremely interesting one. In it, he shows himself in complete harmony with the best English scholarship of his time. He states his ideal in the Newtonian science of the times (Chr. Rest. 15; Chr. Bap'm 50):—

"Great unanimity has obtained in most of the sciences in consequence of the adoption of certain rules of analysis and synthesis; for all who work by the same rules come to the same conclusions. And may it not be possible that, in this divine science of religion, there may yet be a very great degree of unanimity of sentiment and uniformity of practice amongst all who acknowledge its divine authority?"

He then proceeds to lay out a system of interpretation; which, when we compare it section by section, we see to be an excerpt of the critical works of T. H. Horne, Moses Stuart, Ernesti and others. This fact Mr. Campbell acknowledges (Chr. Rest. 95):—

"In the preceding chapters of this work, which are designed rather to develop the *principles*, than to state and illustrate the *rules* of interpretation, we have borrowed much from the most popular and approved writers on the science of Biblical interpretation. And although we have not always quoted directly, we have quoted enough to satisfy the reader that these are not *private* rules, introduced for any private purpose, but that they are *the by law established* (that is, the law of the republic of letters) *principles*, universally acknowledged in all the schools of the nineteenth century."

(Ibid. 96):—

"In re-examining this matter on this occasion, and on extending my researches, I feel myself happy in assuring the reader, that I do not know a single *principle* asserted, that is not already approved by the following: Doctors Campbell, of Aberdeen; Macknight, of Edinburgh; Doddridge, of England; Michaelis, of Gottingen; Horne, of Cambridge; Stuart, of Andover; Ernesti, Lowth, Calmet, Glassius, Harwood, and many others of equal celebrity."

He then gives his celebrated rules of interpretation (Chr. Rest. 96-7; Chr. Sys. 16-7; Chr. Bap'm 61):—

"*Rule* I. On opening any book in the Sacred Scriptures, consider first the *historical circumstances* of the book. These are the order, the title, the author, the date, the place, and the occasion of it.

"II. In examining the contents of any book, as respects precepts, promises, exhortations, &c., observe *who it is that speaks,* and *under what dispensation he officiates.* Is he a Patriarch, a Jew, or a Christian? Consider also the *persons addressed*— their prejudices, characters, and religious relations. Are they Jews or Christians—believers or unbelievers approved or disapproved? This rule is essential to the proper application of every command, promise, threatening, admonition, or exhortation, in the Old Testament or New.

"III. To understand the meaning of what is commanded, promised, taught, etc., the same *philological principles,* deduced from the nature of language, or the same laws of interpretation which are *applied to the language of other books,* are to be applied to the *language of the Bible.*

"IV. *Common usage,* which can only be *ascertained by testimony,* must always *decide the meaning of any word* which has but one signification; but when words have, according to testimony—(i. e., the Dictionary)—more meanings than one, whether literal or figurative, the scope, the context, or parallel passages must decide the meaning; for if common usage, the design of the writer, the context, and parallel passages fail, there can be no certainty in the interpretation of language.

"V. In all tropical language, ascertain the point of resemblance, and judge of the nature of the trope, and its kind, from the point of resemblance.

"VI. In the interpretation of symbols, types, allegories, and parables, this rule is supreme. Ascertain the *point* to be *illustrated;* for comparison is never to be extended beyond that point—to all the attributes, qualities, or circumstances of the symbol, type, allegory, or parable.

"VII. For the salutary and sanctifying intelligence of the oracles of God, the following rule is indispensable:—*We must come within the understanding distance.*"

These rules are an epitome of the entire science.

In the second edition of this work, viz., as the "Christian System," this essay was omitted, and its place given to a constructive statement of Christian doctrines as Mr. Campbell understood them. It was, however, abridged in the "Christian Baptism" (pp. 49-63). It is mainly known in this form.

Conclusions:

1. These principles of interpretation are a direct application of the scientific method of Bacon, Locke and Newton to the study of the Scriptures. This method was the inductive, and is the most evident outgrowth of the Empirical Philosophy. Through the right of private interpretation and the utmost liberty of opinion on these principles, the

Disciples hoped to attain the necessary agreement for restoration and union. These principles had behind them the sanction of the best English scholarship, and even had their roots in the best work of Germany.

2. Herein we see the nature of the scholarship of Alexander Campbell. This was not in any sense original or creative, but only communicative. This is seen in his edition of the New Testament, known as the "Christian Oracles." This work was not a new translation, but only a modified edition of the works of George Campbell, Doddridge and Macknight,—celebrated English and Scotch scholars. Mr. Campbell was the vender of the world's best learning. The substance, if not the form, of his critical conclusions are to be found in such cyclopedias as Horne's Introduction. Likewise, his interpretations were dependent on the Commentaries of Campbell, Doddridge and Macknight. Also, for his ready knowledge of Church History he was indebted to Mosheim and Dupuy. Mr. Campbell was the popularizer of the latest scholastic work. He was ever grateful for the brief contact he had with this at Glasgow University, and kept in connection with the same from his comfortable home on the American frontier, where he received the latest and best issues of the British Press.

3. Herein lies another secret of the conflict. Mr. Campbell brought the best Old World scholarship into the backwoods of America. He easily outstripped all his competitors in his facility in marshalling on his side the great authorities of the world's history. He had no equal in debate or popular exposition. This brilliancy brought him an ardent personal following. It also won him bitter enemies. There was between him and his opponents the chasm of two worlds' cultures. It was inevitable that strife and division should ensue.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Theology of Alexander Campbell.

There remains but one task, and our work is complete, viz., the application of the Principles of the Current Reformation to the leading questions of Christian doctrine. We select as a sample of this the theological positions of Alexander Campbell; not that the thinking of Mr. Campbell was ever meant to become a law to his brethren, but because his mental processes and conclusions may be conceded to have been the ablest and most influential in the history of the Disciples of Christ to the present day.

We shall undertake, then, to give an epitome of Mr. Campbell's theology, as the closing one of this series of essays. This task has been made comparatively easy by the fact that Mr. Campbell has made such an epitome himself. In the preface to the second edition to the volume called "Christianity Restored," he says (Chr. Sys. 12):—

"The present edition substitutes, for the first part of the last, a series of essays on the Christian System, and somewhat enlarges on the second. The continual misrepresentation and misconception of our views on some very fundamental points of the Christian system seem at the present crisis to call for a very definite, clear and connected view of the great outlines and elements of the Christian Institution."

This was the most systematic statement he ever made of his doctrines; and while he disclaims any attempt at authoritative utterance, it affords all that is needed for our present purposes.

It is to be noted that this statement was made apologetically, and to prove his essential orthodoxy. The key to its understanding is to be found in his two fundamental categories,—the covenants in the realm of theology, and Empiricism in that of philosophy.

The outline was made on the basis of the divisions used in the theological encyclopaedias. It had nine points; let us take these in order:—

1. Cosmology: "One God, one system of nature, one universe." (Chr. Sys. 13).

This is stated after the manner of Newton's Principia. Mr. Campbell ever held Newton before him as the model for reverent, scientific work. He shows the same comprehensiveness of view, and uses the same schematism in his teachings.

2. Bibliology: "One God, one moral system, one Bible." (Chr. Sys. 15.)

Thus the Bible is the constitution of God's moral government. It is his covenant with man. As such, it contains all supernatural knowledge in the world. With its completion all revelation ceased. It is thus a perfect statement of God's will for men. It deals with man as he is and as he ought to be, morally and religiously. Its inspiration was stated in harmony with the Lockean theory of knowledge (See p. 64). With this limitation, he accepted the orthodox doctrine of his time.

3. Theology: The usual scheme of attributes is set forth (Chr. Sys. 20).

The Trinity.

The Doctrine of the Trinity was given an interesting treatment. In his appeal for a pure speech, Mr. Campbell decried the terms "Trinity; First, second and third person in the adorable Trinity; God the Son, God the Holy Ghost; Eternal Son," etc., as the language of Ashdod and contrary to the style of the oracles of God (C. B. 159). He recognized that he took this stand at the risk of his reputation for orthodoxy, but he considered that the use of these terms was one of the chief barriers to union; as he says (C. B. 313):—

"But to come to the illustration of how speaking the same things must necessarily issue in thinking the same things, or in the visible and real unity of all disciples on all those topics in which they ought to be united, I will select but one of the topics of capital importance on which there exists a diversity of sentiment. For example: The relation existing between Jesus Christ and his Father. This is one of those topics on which men have philosophized most exuberantly, and on which they have multiplied words and divisons more than on any other subject of human contemplation. Hence have arisen the Trinitarian, Arian, Semiarian, Sabellian, Unitarian and Socinian hypotheses. It is impossible that all these can be true, and yet it is possible that they all may be false theories. Now each of these theories has given rise to a diction, phraseology and style of speaking peculiar to itself. They do not all speak the same things of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit."

(Ibid. 314):—

"Now suppose that all these would abandon every word and sentence not found in the Bible on this subject, and without explanation, limitation or enlargement, quote with equal pleasure and readiness and apply in every suitable occasion every word and sentence found in the volume to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit; how long would divisions on this subject exist? It would be impossible to perpetuate them on this plan."

The expected happened. Mr. Campbell's strictures on the terms were taken as concealing a denial of the doctrine. Accordingly he was

charged with being an Arian, Unitarian, Socinian or what not (C. B. 50, 216-7, 319). In self-defense he was compelled to make a positive statement (C. B. 320). He did this only on the urgency of his friends (C. B. 333). He said he "felt reluctant to speculate on the incomprehensible Jehovah;" that he knew how difficult it was to depart from the terms of the creeds and not be accused of producing a new theory, and adds (C. B. 333):—

"If, however, you will neither make a new theory out of my expositions, nor contend for any speculations on the subject, nor carry the views farther than where I leave off, I will gratify you and other friends with my views of the first sentence in John's Preface to his Testimony,—"In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God."

In this attempt at statement, he warns against pressing too far the analogy of human relations. He distinguishes between the Word of God and the Son of God. "There was no Jesus, no Messiah, no Christ, no Son of God, no Only Begotten before the reign of Augustus Caesar." On the other hand, the eternal relation was wholly of a "mental nature," viz., that "between a word and an idea." He says (C. B. 334):—

"It is a relation of the most sublime order; and no doubt the reason why the name Word is adopted by the apostle in this sentence was because of its superior ability to represent to us the divine relation existing between God and the Saviour prior to his becoming the Son of God." Thus

"As a word is an exact image of an idea, so is 'The Word' an exact image of the invisible God. As a word cannot exist without an idea nor an idea without a word, so God never was without 'The Word,' nor 'The Word' without God; or as a word is of equal age, or co-etaneous with its idea, so 'The Word' and God are co-eternal. And as an idea does not create its word, nor a word its idea, so God did not create 'The Word,' nor the 'Word' God.

"Such a view does the language used by John suggest. And to this do all the Scriptures agree. For 'The Word' was made flesh, and in consequence of becoming incarnate he is styled the Son of God, the only Begotten of the Father. As from eternity God was manifest in and by 'The Word,' so now God is manifest in the flesh. As God was always with 'The Word,' so when the 'Word' becomes flesh he is Emanuel, God with us. As God was never manifest but by the 'Word,' so the heavens and the earth and all things were created by 'The Word.' And as 'The Word' ever was the effulgence or representation of the invisible God, so he will ever be known and adored as 'The Word of God.' So much for the divine and eternal relation between the Saviour and God."

He concludes (C. B. 334):—

"I can give the above views upon no other authority than my own reasonings. I learned them from nobody—I found them in no book."

(Ibid 335):—

"I have acceded to your request with more ease than I could have done, had it not been for a few prating bodies who are always striving to undo my influence by the cry of Unitarianism or Socinianism, or some other obnoxious *ism*. From all *isms* may the Lord save us!"

This statement allayed fairly well the criticism of Mr. Campbell's enemies, but now he met with objections from the camp of his friends. Mr. Stone wrote him in 1827; and after paying him the highest compliments (See p. 88) said (C. B. 378):—

"From you we have learned more fully the evil of speculating on religion, and have made considerable proficiency in correcting ourselves. But, dear sir, how surprised and sorry were we to see in your tenth number, volume four, a great aberration from your professed principles. You there have speculated and theorized on the most important point in theology, and in a manner more mysterious and metaphysical than your predecessors."

Mr. Campbell replied (C. B. 379-380):—

"Brother Stone,—I will call you *brother* because you once told me that you could conscientiously and devoutly pray to the Lord Jesus Christ as though there was no other God in the universe than he. I then asked you of what import and consequence was all the long controversy you had waged with the Calvinists on the Trinitarian questions. They did practically no more than pray to Jesus, and you could consistently and conscientiously do no less. Theoretically, you differed; but practically, you agreed. I think you told me that you were forced into this controversy, and that you regretted it. Some weak heads among my Baptist brethren have been scandalized at me because I called you *brother* Stone. 'What' say they, 'call an *Arian, heretic,* a brother!!!' 'I know nothing of his Arianism,' said I, 'nor of his Calvinism. I never seriously read one entire pamphlet of the whole controversy, and I fraternize with him as I do with the Calvinists.—Neither of their theories are worth one hour; and they who tell me that they supremely venerate and unequivocally worship the King, my Lord and Master, and are willing to obey him in all things, I call my brethren.' . . But, brother Stone, I exceedingly regret that you have said and written so much on *two* topics, neither of which you, nor myself, nor any man living can fully understand. One of these is the burthen of your late letter to me. You do not like my comment on John, ch. 1, ver. 1st,—Well, then, just say so, and let it alone. I said in presenting it I was not about to contend for it, nor to maintain any theory upon the subject. My words are 'Nor would I dispute or contend for this as a theory or speculation with anybody.'"

He closes, (C. B. 380):—

"But I adopt neither system, and will fight for none. I believe that God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son; that Jesus was the Son of God, in the true, full and proper import of these words; that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, which was sent by the concurrence of the Father and the Son to attest and establish the truth, and remain a comforter, an advocate on earth, when Jesus entered the heavens."

Thus the controversy rested in the early days. Both Campbell and Stone tried to remain within the limits of revelation, but could not agree as to its interpretation. They did not make this the cause of division, even on this important question. Mr. Campbell's view came more and more into the ascendancy; so that no longer the orthodoxy of his followers is questioned by any serious thinker (See Chr. Sys. 21-26).

4. Anthropology: The Augustinian doctrine of man's original perfection, fall, and the corruption of the race thereby, was accepted by Mr. Campbell in common with his times. This process was stated in the terms of the Covenant Theology (Chr. Sys. 27-31).

5. Christology: A scheme of redemption was also laid out on the same lines (Chr. Sys. 31-37). In this, God's part was the gift of his Son, Jesus Christ, in his threefold office of Prophet, Priest and King (Chr. Sys. 37-55). The doctrine of the Atonement was not made the subject of special study by Mr. Campbell. This is proved by the fact that his statement is in the main a quotation from Watson's Institutes (ibid. 43-7). He thus accepted the orthodox doctrine of his times. Stone, on the other hand, dissented from this view.

6. Soteriology: Man's part in the process of salvation was stated in the threefold demand of Faith, Repentance and Baptism. Faith is defined in strict conformance with Lockean principles (Chr. Sys. 55-56). (See p. 62). Repentance is reformation, "actual ceasing to do evil, learning to do well" (ibid. 57-8). Baptism is set in conceptions of the Covenant Theology (ibid. 59-62). It was on this subject Mr. Campbell made his chief dogmatic contribution to the world. Let us trace in brief the history of this doctrine from the beginning:—

Baptism.

1. Its action and proper subject.

As a child in a Presbyterian family, Alexander Campbell was sprinkled in infancy. On his coming into the church in his teens he took no thought of baptism (Rich. Mem. I. 49). In the Independent Church at Rich Hill was one James Foster, who held that there was no

authority in the Scriptures for infant baptism. Foster later came to America and lived in the same community as the Campbells (Rich. Mem. I. 82). The year preceding the family's stay in Glasgow the Haldanes were immersed in Edinburgh (Rich. Mem. I. 180-1), but Mr. Ewing opposed this course. While the subject was one of those often discussed in this period, Mr. Campbell as yet gave it no earnest thought (Rich. Mem. I. 186-7). It came up first in America. The occasion was the "Declaration and Address," in which Thomas Campbell set forth his motto,—"Where the Scriptures speak, we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent;" as he further defined it,—"We will require nothing as a matter of faith or duty, except that for which we have a 'thus saith the Lord,' either in expressed command or approved precedent." The silence which followed was broken by Andrew Munro, a bookseller of Canonsburg, who said: "Mr. Campbell, if we adopt that as a basis, then there is an end of infant baptism." Thomas' reply was: "Of course, if infant baptism be not found in Scripture, we can have nothing to do with it," not doubting that adequate authority could be found for it; at which Gen. Acheson exclaimed with emotion: "I hope I may never see the day when my heart will renounce that blessed saying of Scripture, 'Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.'" At which James Foster, who was to prove the critic of the company, said: "Mr. Acheson, I would remark, that in the portion of Scripture you have quoted, there is no reference whatever to infant baptism." (Rich. Mem. I. 237-8). Thus, from the beginning baptism was a crucial question in the Christian Association. It was destined to be the one more than all others on which their principles were to be tested. But at this time Thomas Campbell did not see any contradiction between these principles and infant baptism, at most he held that the question should be a matter of forbearance, and that they should not hastily abandon a usage of so long standing in religious society, that baptism should be put among the "non-essentials," and be held as not of such importance as faith and righteousness. Soon after, while riding together, James Foster asked: "Father Campbell, how could you in the absence of any authority in the Word of God, baptize a child in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit?" The elder Campbell replied in irritation: "Sir, you are the most intractable person I ever met." (Rich. Mem. I. 240). Soon after, while young Alexander was explaining the principles of the "Declaration and Address" to Mr. Riddle, a Presbyterian minister, the latter said: "Sir, these words, however plausible in appearance, are not sound, for if you

follow these out, you must become a Baptist." At which the young man asked in surprise: "Why, sir, is there in the Scripture no expressed precept or precedent for infant baptism?" "Not one, sir," was Mr. Riddle's emphatic response. (Rich. Mem. I. 250). This set him thinking. He ordered from Munro all the books he could find on infant baptism. He read nothing on the other side. He knew little or nothing of the Baptists at this time, and was much prejudiced against them. When the difficulty was laid before the father he received as reply: "We have made our appeal to the law and testimony. Whatever is not found therein we must of course abandon." But Alexander, not liking to hold any question in a state of uncertainty, betook himself again to his Paedo-Baptist authorities. Not being satisfied with their arguments, he turned to his Greek Testament. This made the matter worse. At last he had to admit that there were no "express terms or precedents" for the practice of infant baptism in the Scriptures. But he said (Rich. Mem. I. 251):—

"As for those who are already members of the Church, and participants of the Lord's Supper, I can see no propriety, even if the Scriptural evidence for infant baptism be found deficient, in their unchurching or paganizing themselves, or in putting off Christ, merely for the sake of making a new profession; thus going out of the Church merely for the sake of coming in again."

But in the case of new converts he concluded that they ought to preach and practice "apostolic baptism." Here at the request of his father he let the matter rest. Several incidents contributed to bring it up again. The Synod of Pittsburg made as one of their objections to the Christian Association (Rich. Mem. 328) "for declaring that the administration of baptism to infants is not authorized by scriptural precept or example, and is a matter of indifference, yet administering that ordinance while holding such an opinion."

Alexander replied to this:

"We dare not inculcate infant baptism in the name of the Lord as indispensably incumbent upon Christians, because the Lord has nowhere expressly enjoined it. If anything can be produced on this head, we should be glad to see it. Until this be done, we think it highly antiscriptural to make it a term of communion, for to do this is to make it a term of salvation."

and defines their position at that time (Rich. Mem. I. 344-5):

"We look at baptism now in nearly the same point of view in which the primitive Church looked at circumcision, and consider the cases, if not altogether yet nearly parallel; so far so, that we must either forbear or otherwise reject a great number of God's dear children without his special warrant, if not in express violation of his Divine commands."

Then came a discussion with a Baptist preacher in the home of his father-in-law, Mr. Brown. Alexander ably defended infant baptism, but afterward was not entirely satisfied with his arguments (Rich. Mem. I. 362). Next was the notice of the fact that three members of the Christian Association, Joseph Bryant, Margaret Fullerton and Abraham Altars, had not received the rite in any way. The question now took a practical aspect. Should these partake of the Communion? (Rich. Mem. I. 372). As they wished immersion, Thomas Campbell consented to perform the rite. It was done in a singular way. They went to a deep pool in Buffalo Creek. The candidates walked into the water until it came to their shoulders. Thomas Campbell, standing upon a root, projecting from the bank, bent their heads into the water, repeating in each case the baptismal formula. So serious an occasion was not wanting its cynic. James Foster, the irrepressible, did not approve the manner of baptism, nor did he think that one who had not been immersed himself should immerse others (Rich. Mem. I. 373). Now the question was carried into the home of Alexander. A child had been born there. The maternal grandparents, as good Presbyterians, wished that it be baptized. Just before this Alexander, in preaching upon the Great Commission, when he came to the part on baptism, said: "As I am sure it is unscriptural to make this matter a term of communion, I let it slip. I wish to think and let think on these matters." (Rich. Mem. I. 392). But it would not slip. It had invaded his own household. He now went over the whole ground anew. He saw that baptism was a matter of much more importance than he had thought, that it was a direct ordinance of Christ, that it was not enough to admit that baptism was without divine warrant. Was the baptism of a believer a duty? Was that baptism immersion only? He continued his studies and finally being convinced that his own condition was that of an unbaptized person, went without confiding his decision to anyone to seek Matthias Luce, a Baptist preacher of Washington, to get him to perform the rite (Rich. Mem. I. 395). By a strange coincidence, as he stopped at the house of his father on the way, his sister Dorothea took him aside and confided to him that she had been troubled about her baptism and that she wished to be immersed and requested him to lay the case before their father. He smiled and told her the purpose of his trip. They went to Thomas Campbell, who, to their surprise, made no objection. Arrangements were made for the performance of the rite June 12, 1812.

On the morning of that day, Thomas had his wife put up a change of clothing for the two of them. This was his first intimation of his

purpose to be immersed with his children. Arriving at the place appointed, he made a long address, reviewing the whole ground gone over. Alexander followed in a defense of what they were about to do. Meanwhile James Hanen took his wife aside and they decided to join the others. The seven were immersed, Thomas Campbell and wife, A. Campbell and wife, James Hanen and wife, and Dorothea, upon the simple confession of faith. The meeting was seven hours long (Rich. Mem. I. 396). On the next Sunday James Foster and others followed their example. At this General Acheson and those opposed to immersion left the Brush Run Church. Immersion became a distinctive mark of the movement of the Campbells. A long and painful course was now ended. Most of the way had been gone blindly. Now all felt they had seen a new light.

Thus the questions of the proper action and proper subject of baptism were settled by 1812. This brought them on Baptist ground and resulted in the union with the Baptists (See p. 99).

The questions of the design and place of Baptism in the programme of Restoration did not arise until later.

2. Design: The doctrine of the Design of Baptism was an outgrowth of the debates on Baptism with Paedo-Baptist antagonists. Mr. Campbell went into these contests as the champion of the Baptist cause. The issue was forced upon him (C. B. 664), but he certainly felt himself in full harmony with his Baptist brethren on this question. In the process of these discussions, he derived a doctrine of the import or meaning of baptism which proved to be the chief reason for his excision from that body. The origin of this doctrine is frankly stated by Mr. Campbell (Harb. '38, 467-8):—

"In 1820 the Editor had a debate with Mr. Walker on the *subject* and *action* of Christian baptism. He had not then turned his thoughts to the special *meaning* or design of that ordinance. Either during that discussion, or in transcribing it for the press, an impression was made on his mind that baptism had a very important meaning and was some way connected with remission of sins; but engaged so much in other inquiries, it was put on file for further consideration." (See Walker Deb. 13, 17, 170; Rich. Mem. II. 20). "Immediately on receiving a challenge from Mr. Wm. L. McCalla, of Kentucky, dated May 17, 1823, I resolved to settle the true meaning of baptism before I ever debated the subject again. To examine this matter, I went to my Testament with the zeal of a freshman. Mr. Thomas Campbell and myself discussed this matter at considerable length for some months. It was not named to a third person till July or August following, when Brother Walter Scott made his first visit to my residence. During his stay my father informed him, in my presence, of the contemplated

debate, and stated at considerable length the views of baptism which we had agreed to offer on the occasion. As it had not been divulged to any other person, I was anxious for the judgment of one whom I so highly esteemed on account of his knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and waited for his opinion with much interest. He gave it upon the whole in favor of the views offered; and more than once during his stay recommended the importance of giving such a view in the approaching discussion."

Scott had most likely been prepared for this by the pamphlet "On Baptism," sent out by the New York Church in 1820 (See Baxter "Life of Scott," 47-53).

Accordingly, in the McCalla Debate Mr. Campbell introduced the doctrine as one of his chief arguments for the proper subject of baptism, viz., the believer (McCalla Deb. 116-7, 134-7, 146; Rich. Mem. II. 80-3). This argument runs as follows: "Baptism is for the remission of sins. The term is 'sins,' the plural; not the 'original sin,' a singular. An infant cannot be guilty of sins; hence he is not a proper subject for baptism." The center of interest in this argument was its major premise. This was evidently derived from Acts 2:38; and although the view was novel, Mr. Campbell began then and there to enforce it upon his Baptist brethren (Harb. '38, 468-9; McCalla Deb. 144). Thus this doctrine, formulated in discussion, was brought forward as one of the items of the Reformation (C. B. 401). To Walter Scott, however, goes the honor of having reduced it to practice. As the evangelist of the Mahoning Association, he prepared a series of sermons on the Ancient Gospel. For a while perplexed as to how to state his message for the practical aid of the unconverted, he incorporated baptism as designed for the remission of sins and set it in order: 1. Faith, 2. Repentance, 3. Baptism, 4. Remission of Sins, 5. The Holy Spirit (Rich Mem. II. 208). This message he felt to be so novel that he first went outside the limits of the Association to proclaim it. (Rich. Mem. II. 209). Taking courage then, he set forth the doctrine at New Lisbon, Ohio, and baptized a candidate, annexing to the usual formula, the words, "for the remission of sins." Great excitement followed. Scott passed like a meteor throughout the Western Reserve. The preachers took up the message. The first great evangelistic movement among the followers of the Campbells resulted (Harb. 38, 469). Rumors of the commotion came to Bethany. The Campbells feared that Scott had betrayed the cause by his precipitancy. The father was sent to inquire into the matter, and returning with the verdict of approval, the son now came out with the doctrinal statement of their positions in the essays on the Ancient Gospel (Rich. Mem. II. 219).

He says (C. B. 416):—

"And now I propose to do three things. 1st. To show that the apostles addressed Christians as having their sins remitted. 2d. That frequent allusions to baptism in the sacred epistles, represent it as an ablution. And in the third place I must show that it is as plainly affirmed in the New Testament that *God forgives men's sins in the act of immersion,* as that he will raise the dead at the voice of the archangel, or as that Jesus Christ will come again to judge the world."

This third proposition he enlarges as follows (C. B. 416):—

"In the third place, I proceed to show that we have the most explicit proof *that God forgives sins for the name's sake of his Son, or when the name of Jesus Christ is named upon us in immersion:—that in, and by, the act of immersion, so soon as our bodies are put under water, at that very instant our former, or 'old sins' are all washed away, provided only that we are true believers.* This was the view and the expectation of every one who was immersed in the apostolic age; and it was a consciousness of having received this blessing that caused them to rejoice in the Lord, and, like the eunuch, to 'go on their way rejoicing.' When Jesus commanded reformation and forgiveness of sins to be announced in his name to all nations, he commanded men to receive immersion to the confirmation of this promise. Thus we find that when the gospel was announced on Pentecost, and when Peter opened the kingdom of heaven to the Jews, he commanded them to be immersed for the remission of sins. *This is quite sufficient, if we had not another word on the subject. I say it is quite sufficient to show that the forgiveness of sins and Christian immersion were, in their first proclamations by the holy apostles inseparably connected together.* Peter, to whom were committed the keys, opened the kingdom of heaven in this manner, and made repentance, or reformation, and immersion, equally necessary to forgiveness. In the common version it reads thus: 'Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' When any thing is done for any purpose, it is always understood that there is a necessary connexion betwixt that which is done, and the object in view. When a person is immersed for the remission of sins, it is just the same as if expressed, in order to obtain the remission of sins."

This was not the doctrine that baptism had in itself some magical power, so as to work forgiveness of sins, etc. Mr. Campbell says (C. B. 436):—

"We connect faith with immersion as essential to forgiveness—and therefore, as was said of old, 'According to your faith, so be it to you,' so say we of immersion. He that goes down into the water to put on Christ, in the faith that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin, and that he has appointed immersion as the medium, and the act of ours, through and in which he actually and formally remits our sins, has when immersed the actual remission of his sins. So that he is dead by sin, buried with Jesus, and is born again, or raised to life again,

a life new and divine, in and through the act of immersion. This we have seen in the preceding essays is the Bible import of the one immersion."

This efficacy is secured solely by divine appointment (C. B. 436, 438). Here the positive precept of the Covenant Theology enters as an essential factor of the doctrine. (See p. 49). Hence the whole virtue of baptism is obedience. As such, it is the medium of divine blessings. This medium must be evident to consciousness; hence it must be an object of sense. He says (C. B. 446) :—

"And one of the better promises on which the new economy is established, one of the superior excellencies of the New Covenant, is, that under it the forgiveness of sins is imparted, and the conscience perfected in and by means *addressed to our senses,* and of the easiest access to every believer of the philanthropy of God. So that the instant of time, and the means by which, the formal remission is granted, is an *object of sense,* and a proper subject of remembrance. Hence those who apostatized from the faith are said to have 'forgotten that they were purified from their old or former sins'; i. e., sins committed before immersion. From which it is as clear as demonstration itself, that the forgiveness of sins was through some sensible means, or it could not have been a proper subject of remembrance."

Here the Empiricism of Mr. Campbell appears. As such, baptism is likened to the marriage rite (C. B. 446). In it the believer enters into legal and real union with Christ, and can claim all the blessings therein covenanted. Thus (C. B. 486) :—

"In the natural order of the evangelical economy, the items stand thus:—1. Faith; 2. Reformation; 3. Immersion; 4. Remission of sins; 5. Holy Spirit; and 6. Eternal Life. We do not teach that one of these precedes the other, as cause and effect; but that they are all naturally connected, and all, in this order, embraced in the glad tidings of salvation."

3. Place: The place of baptism in the Restoration was determined by this philosophy of its meaning. Thomas and Alexander Campbell began with the determination that this rite should be a matter of forbearance (Rich. Mem. I. 344). They took this stand in the interest of union. Stone held also the same position. Baptism was also a matter of forbearance in some of the Scotch Baptist Churches; i. e., those of James A. Haldane and Alexander Carson (C. B. 394, 407, 229). Others, as the New York Church, were close immersionists (C. B. 389). In Mr. Campbell's review of the history of these churches, he treats this question (C. B. 457) :—

"While all of the above churches manifest a scrupulous regard to the grand constitutional principles of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ,

they seem to differ from each other in their views of the ordinance of the Great King on the subject of naturalization. Some of them receive unnaturalized persons into his realm on the ground of forbearance. On this subject I write with great caution, for I know this question of forbearance has in it some perplexities of no easy solution, and is at least of as difficult solution as that concerning the amalgamation of the Jews and Gentiles in the Christian Church, decided by the apostles and elders in the city of Jerusalem."

He is not uncertain as to the primitive practice, but recognizes that a breach has been made in Zion, and that now many have the traits of Christian character who have not complied with the formal terms of entrance. He says (C. B. 457):—

"But the question of the greatest difficulty to decide, is, whether there should be any laws or rules adopted by the churches relating to the practice of receiving persons unimmersed in the assembles of the saints. Whether on the ground of forbearance, as it is called, such persons as have been once sprinkled, or not at all, but who are satisfied with their sprinkling, or without any, are, on their solicitation, to be received into any particular congregation, and to be treated in all respects as those who have, by their own voluntary act and deed, been naturalized and constitutionally admitted into the kingdom. To make a law that such should be received, appears to me, after long and close deliberation, a usurpation of the legislative authority vested in the holy apostles, and of dangerous tendency in the administration of the Reign of Heaven. Again, to say that no weak brother, however honest in his professions, excellent in his deportment and amiable in his character, who cannot be convinced but that his infant sprinkling is Christian baptism, and who solicits a participation with us in the festivities of Zion: I say, to say by a stern decree that none such shall on any account be received, appears to be illiberal, unkind, censorious, and opposite to that benevolence which is one of the primary virtues of Christianity."

While he halted a long time between these two opinions, he finally cast the weight of his personality in favor of the former. It is possible that his union with the Baptists, and his stubborn fight for fifteen years to maintain his standing among them, may have aided his decission (C. B. 217). Also, his placing the acceptance of the proposition that Jesus is the Messiah and the single act of inauguration, viz., baptism, in the room of all credal demands upon the new convert, may have confirmed his conviction of the place and importance of this institution (C. B. 140). At least, at the emergence from the conflict with the Baptists, the churches of the Reformation were practically close-immersionist and have remained so to this day. But Mr. Campbell, and those who followed in the same spirit, maintained an attitude of

appreciation for the pious un-immersed of all parties; as he said in the famous letter to the Lady of Lunenburg (Harb. '37, 411-2):—

"But who is a Christian? I answer, every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will.

"I cannot, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their own knowledge and consent as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven."

(See also Rice Deb. 544).

7. Pneumatology: Baptism was the transition to a new state. See "Essay on Remission of Sins" (Chr. Sys. 63-71). In this state the Holy Spirit is the indwelling power (See p. 68).

8. Ecclesiology: (Chr. Sys. 77-111) (See p. 98).

9. Eschatology: (Chr. Sys. 71-5). The orthodox position was taken, yet this was not made a test of fellowship, as in the case of Aylett Raines (Rich. Mem. II.).

Thus, Dear Reader, our task is finished. Note how this movement came out of the larger religious world, that it took the best therefrom—its religious impulses, its models, its scholarship,—as its rights of inheritance. It has nothing to fear also from the scholarship of our day. It may well emulate the zeal for union among some of its neighbors. Let its sons go in and out in all the world's social and religious activities. Let them give and take; let them learn and teach; let them ever keep humble in vision of the vast hosts of God;—this lesson is the moral of this little history, which a better art would have left unstated.

FINIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

	Abbreviations used in book.
Ames, William, "Medulla Theologiae."	
Baxter, William, "Life of Walter Scott," 1874.	
Boston, Thos., "Memoirs."	
Campbell, Thos., "Declaration and Address," 1809.	
Campbell, Alexander, "Debate with John Walker," 1820.	
"Debate with W. L. McCalla," 1823.	
"The Christian Baptist," 1823—1830. Burnett's Edition	C. B.
"Debate with Robert Owen," 1829.	
"The Millennial Harbinger," monthly periodical, 40 vols., 1830—1870,	Harb. '30.
Christianity Restored.	Chr. Rest.
"Debate with Bishop Purcell," 1837. Christian System.	Chr. Sys.
"Debate with Rev. N. L. Rice," 1843. Christian Baptism.	Chr. Bap'm.
"Memoirs of Thos. Campbell," 1861.	
Coccejus, "De Foedere et Testamento Dei."	
Fisher, Edward, "Marrow of Modern Divinity."	
Fisher, Geo. P., "History of Doctrine."	
Grotius, "De Jure Belli et Pacis."	
Hayden, A. S., "History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve," 1875.	Hay.
Jefferson, *et al.*, "The Federalist."	
Kaftan, "The Truth of the Christian Religion."	
Locke, John, "Essay on the Human Understanding."	
"Reasonableness of Christianity."	
Richardson, Robert, "Memoirs of A. Campbell," 1868, 2 vols.	Rich., Mem.
Rousseau, "Contrat Social."	
Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom."	
Stone, B. W., "The Christian Messenger," 1826, monthly periodical.	Chr. Mess.
"Autobiography of B. W. Stone," 1846.	
Williams, John Augustus, "Life of Elder John Smith," 1870.	
Witsius, "The Economy of the Covenants of God with Men."	
Young, C. A., "Historical Documents, illustrating Christian Union."	Hist. Doc.

621

WINCKLER BIND
JUL 1949

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX7321.V3 1907
Van Kirk, Hir A history of the theology
3 0645 0004 1403 3